

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 4, 1993

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We know how important it is to use our abilities in ways that encourage the common good and how compelling it is that we are dedicated to our duties and accomplish our tasks with integrity and faithfulness. Yet, O gracious God, we know when we are honest with ourselves, we acknowledge that so much of what we think or do has come to us from the contributions of others and the support and love of family and friends, of teachers and colleagues. O God, make us specially appreciative of these gifts and give us hearts of thankfulness and praise for support that each of us has received. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] if she would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 920. An act to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes.

## THE GUN VIOLENCE DESTROYING OUR NATION'S COMMUNITIES

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to perform a task which

is as difficult as, I believe, it is necessary. As you know, the carnage that is occurring on our streets as a result of the easy availability of sophisticated firearms is a brutal fact of life which I am committed to ending. I have introduced H.R. 661, the Gun Violence Economic Equity Act, to make gun manufacturers, importers and dealers strictly liable for damages directly resulting from the illegal use of their products. I am pleased to be in the distinguished company of my colleagues from Illinois, Senator PAUL SIMON and Congressmen GUTIERREZ and REYNOLDS, as well as Mayor Daley of Chicago, my good friend MAJOR OWENS of New York and others who are committed to making 1993 the year we begin to end the slaughter.

Last year in Chicago, 927 men, women, and children were killed by guns. But numbers mean little. We may not be able to see the faces of the fallen, but we should, in this body, at least hear their names—this month—and every month, lest we forget the terrible responsibility we bear in the House and Senate as long as we fail to pass sound gun control legislation such as my bill, H.R. 661, or the Brady bill, which passed this House last year but died in the Senate. The following people were killed by firearms in Cook County, IL, just last month in January, 1993:

Charles Armstrong, Kenneth Allison, Mark Anderson, Ricardo Aldana, Matheo Allen, Willie Borges, Sonia Buponts, James Baber, Antwon Cox, Martino Dixon, Jessie Daniels, Raymond Dunklin, Perry Darty, Richard Ehlenfeldt, Lynn Ehlenfeldt, Joyce Foster, Frank Gorzelanny, Evelyn Gorzelanny, Michael Gastro, Jerry Gray, and Eugene Garfield.

Tyrone Harris, Alison Hearn, Lashannon Hines, Gabriel Joiner, Mike Jabra, Samuel Johnson, Malcom Kyles, Tom Mennes, Guadalupe Maldonado, Adam Morish, Lloyd Moore, Joel Mendoza, Marcus Nelson, Willie C. Nix, Walter Nawrocki, Antoine Ord, Clinton Parker, Kevin Page, Terry Pullian, James Richardson, and Tatiana Redmond.

Roscoe Robinson, Frank Rucker, Fabien Small, Rico Solis, William Stewart, Javier Torres, Jr., Robert Williams, and Steven Winn.

## THE CAMPAIGN TO STREAMLINE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I joined several of my colleagues from the House and Senate at a

White House press conference where President Clinton and Vice President GORE unveiled their new nationwide campaign to streamline the Federal Government.

The national performance review, as it is called, is supposed to carry through on the President's commitment to reinvent Government by improving Government services and cutting bureaucratic waste.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we Republicans have been talking about all along: Going as far as we can to cut Federal spending before we even think about asking the American people to contribute another dime of their hard-earned money to the Treasury.

While I share the administration's enthusiasm about this program, my biggest concern is that they are planning to do the review from the inside out. Why not take a lesson from the private sector and utilize objective advice from outside sources and business experts? It is naive to believe that the huge Federal bureaucracy will reform itself.

We want a leaner, trimmer bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, but let us make sure we do not sacrifice objectivity along the way.

□ 1110

## MORE BOUNCE FOR THE BUCK

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, more bounce for the buck. More bounce for the buck. That is what we the American people and we the taxpayers will get as a result of a 6 months' intensive review of the Federal Government, called national performance review, ordered yesterday by President Clinton, to be chaired by our former colleague and friend, now Vice President ALBERT GORE.

What this is intended to do is to ferret out, in all of the nooks and crannies of Federal Government, evidences of waste, mismanagement, duplication, any evidence where money is not being used to its fullest extent and to its fullest efficiency.

The campaign is called reinventing Government. There will be a series of 800 numbers which taxpayers can call in order to give recommendations to this panel studying Government for the next 6 months. There will also be a post office drop at the White House called reinventing Government to which written comments can be sent.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

I do hope that all of the taxpayers and all of the citizens of this land and, of course, the Third District of Kentucky, will take fullest advantage of this opportunity to make our taxpayers' dollars bounce as high as they can possibly bounce.

#### OUT OF ORDER?

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during this time on each of the past 2 days I have stood in this well and referred to letters and phone calls that I have received from people throughout the Third District of Georgia. I expressed their concerns, their fears, and their definition of the character of those of us who are involved in their Government.

On each of those 2 days the Chair questioned my remarks and referred them to the Parliamentarian. Mr. Speaker, I differ with that questioning.

Mr. Speaker, I will be out of order the day I do not express the views of those who have sent me here to represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I will be out of order the day I fail to carry through with the promises that I made when I asked those same people to send me here to represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I will be out of order when I listen to the bureaucrats inside this beltway instead of the people of the Third District of Georgia.

#### IT'S THE JOBS, STUPID

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, it has become fashionable for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to hold up these signs and try to tell everybody, "It's the spending, stupid."

Unfortunately, I forgot my sign today, but if I had it, I would hold it up and point it in their direction and say, "It's jobs, stupid."

I visited the Capitol Hill Club the other day to meet with some highway contractors. They were all in line behind the President's spending package with regard to economic stimulus in public works. They want more highways, they want more jobs, they want more road and bridge construction.

I talked to small businessmen; they are all in line because they think the tax credit makes sense, it helps them expand and hire more employees.

I talked to parents, and they are excited about summer jobs for their young people; 700,000 summer jobs seems like a good idea to them.

I talked with these same parents, and they are excited about permanent jobs,

500,000 permanent jobs for their kids when they get out of high school because they do not want the kids to come home and live with them.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that the issue really is the jobs. My constituents are voting 2 to 1 in their calls to me in support of the President's plan. I think they understand, "It is the jobs, stupid."

#### DAVIS-BACON ACT SHOULD BE REPEALED

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the freshman class I have accepted the President's challenge to come up with spending cuts. My constituents are telling me loud and clear—cut spending, don't raise our taxes again.

I propose that the Davis-Bacon Act be repealed. This act was first passed in 1931. Since then it has been used effectively to discriminate against small businesses and minority-owned businesses. These businesses are blocked from access to Federal contracts because they are unable to pay the high union wages mandated by the Department of Labor.

The wages paid on Federal projects should be set by competitive bids, not by Department of Labor bureaucrats. Davis-Bacon inflates Federal construction costs by more than \$1 billion a year. The American taxpayer pays the bill for this rigging process. Repeal of this provision will empower minorities and small businesses, and it will save \$5.7 billion over 5 years.

#### OUR SURVIVAL DEPENDS ON REAL, HONEST ECONOMIC REFORM

(Ms. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, 15 days ago, President Bill Clinton released his economic blueprint to an American people who are anxious for real, honest economic reform. And from living rooms to corporate board rooms, Americans are encouraged by the President's plan that trims the Federal deficit by \$700 billion over 5 years, reforms Government, and keeps America competitive in an emerging global market.

Last week President Clinton gained the support of an array of business and labor leaders. Baxter International's Vernon Loucks acknowledged the need for all Americans to pull together when he said:

There isn't going to be a future if we don't get these things solved.

And while many Americans want to see more spending cuts as part of the

package, large majorities still approve of the President and his plan. Americans understand that we all share responsibility for reinvigorating our Nation.

Yesterday, President Clinton continued his drive to reinvent Government when he named Vice President GORE to lead a national performance review. This audit will examine the operations of every Government agency and service. It seeks public input, and in the end will achieve savings, eliminate duplication, and make Government more responsive to the public.

Perhaps the chairman of Coca-Cola put it best when he said:

If [Clinton] succeeds, we all succeed. If he fails, we all fail.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO PRESIDENT CLINTON FOR HIS SPEECH AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, we have not had many compliments coming from this side of the aisle recently for President Clinton, and I do not know that there will be many forthcoming. But I believe we should extend congratulations to President Clinton for what I believe was an outstanding speech that he gave last Friday at American University. My concern, of course, was that it was slightly in conflict with some of the things that I heard him say in Seattle when he was addressing the employees of Boeing.

His speech at American University, if followed through, will, I believe, provide a great boost to the American economy and to the job creation which is so necessary here. His most protuberant line, I believe, was, "compete, not retreat," as we look at the challenge of international trade. I hope very much that this Congress will join in the pursuit of a good North American free trade agreement, and it is also my hope, Mr. Speaker, that following the lines as outlined by President Clinton, that we will move even further and it is my hope we will create a United States-Japan free-trade agreement.

#### WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ECONOMIC PLAN

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the pontifications of some national talk show hosts, President Clinton's economic plan is gaining wide-spread support from business and industry leaders in this country and from the international financial community.



The CEO's of some of our largest companies, Ford Motor Co., Atlantic Richfield, American Airlines, just to name a few, realize we must take comprehensive action to put our fiscal house in order and revitalize our economy for the long term. They see the President's plan as the logical way to achieve those goals; through investment tax credits, research and development tax incentives, and small business tax incentives that will promote job growth. Through worker training programs that will give our workers the skills to win the high-tech, high-wage jobs of the new global economy. And through serious, long-term deficit reduction.

The President's plan lays the foundation for real, lasting recovery, a recovery rooted in a renewed partnership between business, government, and the American people. These leaders of corporate America who support the President are ready to seal that partnership, and to move beyond narrow interests for the benefit of the country as a whole, and for all of our people for the long run. That is a lead we would all be wise to follow.

□ 1120

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, an estimated 35 million Americans lack health insurance, the largest number of uninsured in 25 years. There are steps that we can take immediately to heal our failing health care system.

I believe that one of the most important steps that needs to be taken is to provide preventive services in all benefit packages. Prevention plays a crucial role in improving the health of our Nation. Benefits of prevention include rewards from averting human suffering by reducing the amount of illness and disability, and by preventing premature death. In most cases, preventive health measures can provide a cost-effective alternative to other belated health care approaches.

Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 36, the Comprehensive Preventive Health and Promotion Act of 1993, which provides coverage for periodic health exams, health screening, counseling, immunizations, and health promotion.

Accordingly, I urge all my colleagues who are interested in helping all Americans achieve healthier, more productive lives to cosponsor H.R. 36, our preventive health care measure.

#### YOU ASKED FOR IT, YOU GOT IT, AMERICA

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, you were tired of Government business as usual, so you elected a new Government. You were sick of Government waste and abuse, so here is a vehicle to clean it up.

Yesterday, President Clinton announced his plan to order a 6-month National Performance Review of the Federal Government. I am determined that this will not be a show study, as it has been in the past. Rather, this study will have concrete recommendations that will be acted upon immediately.

One hundred Federal managers will examine the basic assumptions of every program in Government. The questions that must be answered will be: Does the program work? Does it provide quality service? Does it encourage innovation and reward hard work?

The best component of this study will be its involvement of the American public—the very people that these programs affect, either directly or indirectly.

We have taken an oath to protect taxpayer money and ensure that every penny is well spent and safely invested. The establishment of this effort is the first big step to achieving this commitment.

This will be a partnership between the Congress, the administration, and the American public—only by working together will it work. America, you asked for it. Now let us make it work.

#### ANOTHER ENTRY IN THE CLINTON DICTIONARY: "STREAMLINE"

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we read in the paper that Vice President GORE has been appointed to head a task force on streamlining the bureaucracy. We have heard so much talk about streamlining the Government, but once again, very few details are provided. How are they going to streamline the Government? By adding another commission to the Federal bureaucracy to do another study to make more recommendations to Congress?

What will they call this new office? The office of the streamliner general? And who will work there? Staff will certainly be needed to assist the Vice President with his duties. How will the assistant streamliners be paid? Maybe they will be shifted from positions which were cut a few weeks ago? That would certainly nullify the President's earlier claims about reducing personnel. But, as we all know, the Vice President is into recycling—it looks like the administration is also into recycling Government staff.

So, Mr. Speaker, another entry in the Clinton dictionary evolves: "To

streamline—the act of reducing staff by shifting them to another sector of the Government in order to study reasons why they were cut in the first place."

But, do not get me wrong. I wholeheartedly support cutting waste and fraud in the Federal Government. There are plenty of unnecessary programs and positions throughout the Federal bureaucracy. But I want to hear details of the President's cuts—not reports about new commissions.

#### NUTRITIONAL COUNSELING—A MEANS OF IMPROVING AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Mrs. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, in this era of belt tightening, there is growing recognition of home-based health care as the most appropriate and cost-effective method for patient treatment. This movement away from hospitalization depends in part on providing patients with information about good nutrition.

I rise to ask consideration of H.R. 1047, legislation I introduced last week, which will include nutritional counseling as a home health service under the Social Security Act.

A registered dietician working with a patient in home care can improve prenatal care, prevent an acute diabetic attack, or lessen the ravages of osteoporosis.

This legislation offers us a means to cut costs in the short term, as well as in the long run. By moving H.R. 1047 forward, we will improve patients' quality of life and make better use of scarce health care dollars. Patients want to be in their own homes, where the cost of health care is far lower.

I urge my colleagues to consider joining me in support of this commonsense approach to improving America's health care system.

#### ALMOST EVERY FEDERAL PROGRAM BENEFITS THE BUREAUCRATS RATHER THAN THE INTENDED BENEFICIARIES

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many people across the country today who are wondering if the Federal Government can do anything in an economical or efficient manner. Almost every Federal social program seems to benefit primarily the bureaucrats who work for it rather than the intended beneficiaries.

So much money is being wasted, Mr. Speaker, that the people are really getting fed up. The Government is taking

so much money from the individuals and families of this Nation and giving back so little in return.

This point was really brought home in a recent column by Joseph Perkins of the San Diego Union Tribune. Mr. Perkins said the Census Bureau has calculated that it would take \$5,515 per family to lift every poor family in this country above the poverty line. This adds up to \$38.5 billion, less than one-fifth of the \$225 billion that the Government at all levels actually spent on antipoverty programs without reaching that goal.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers would be better off if we did away with all the antipoverty programs and just gave direct grants to the poor. Only our overpaid, underworked army of Federal poverty bureaucrats would suffer.

I include the article by Mr. Perkins. [From the Washington Times, Feb. 23, 1993]

#### SURE CURE FOR POVERTY

(By Joseph Perkins)

There are a few matters of public policy on which I find myself in agreement with Hillary Clinton. But we are of like mind on the issue of welfare reform.

In a recent Newsweek interview, the first lady sounded very much like a conservative as she pondered the problems of America's underclass. "The culture of poverty in this country has become institutionalized," said she, adding that "a different set of approaches" is needed to wean the poor from long-term welfare dependency.

It remains to be seen whether her thinking is reflected in the new administration's promised welfare reform package. From what has been heard so far from, among others, Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, the prospect does not appear especially good.

It stands to reason that, to deinstitutionalize the culture of poverty of which the first lady spoke, the existing welfare system needs to be completely overhauled. Yet, Miss Shalala is talking about adding new programs to the failing welfare system, at a minimum cost to taxpayers of \$6 billion.

On the face, the proposed new programs seem benign: expanded education and training for welfare recipients, as well as child care allowances and transportation assistance. Yet, if the federal government spent an additional \$100 billion on these new programs, there almost certainly would remain as many people on the welfare rolls.

That's because there is no correlation between how much money the government spends on welfare and how many people escape poverty. If there were such a link, poverty would have been wiped from the face of America a long time ago.

Since President Lyndon Johnson launched the vaunted War on Poverty more than a quarter-century ago, the United States has spent \$3.5 trillion on welfare. That exceeds the full cost of World War II after adjusting for inflation.

What have American taxpayers seen for the average \$50,000 per household they have contributed toward Johnson's alms race? A poverty rate that has been virtually unchanged over the last 25 years from 14.7 percent in 1966 to 14.2 percent in 1991.

The welfare establishment is hopeful that President Clinton will be persuaded to invest additional money on the poor. But America

already is spending more than enough to eliminate poverty.

Indeed, the Census Bureau calculated last year that the amount of money required to lift America's 7 million poor families above the poverty line was \$5,515 per family. That adds up to \$38.5 billion, less than one-fifth the \$225 billion that government at all levels actually spent on anti-poverty programs.

So, then, let us say President Clinton wanted to make good on his campaign pledge to end welfare as we know it. He simply could order his Treasury secretary to mail \$5,600 checks to every poor family in the land. Taxpayers would end up saving roughly \$185 billion a year.

Hillary Clinton is on the right track when she says behavior modification rather than additional welfare spending is the key to solving the poverty problem. The chronic poor remain so largely because they bend toward self-defeating behavior that impedes their upward mobility.

Robert Rector, who has written frequently about poverty in America, speaks of "behavioral poverty," a breakdown in the values of conduct that lead to the formation of healthy families, stable personalities and self-sufficiency.

Such behavioral poverty, says Mr. Rector, produces assorted pathologies: dependency and eroded work ethic, lack of educational aspiration and achievement, inability or unwillingness to control one's children, increased single parenthood and illegitimacy, criminal activity, and drug and alcohol abuse.

The question that should be uppermost in the minds of Clinton administration welfare reformers is how best to modify the behavior of the underclass. If the government somehow can change the chronic poor's behavior patterns, there will be fewer of them.

Where to start? The poverty data provide a clue. A family with two parents, both high school graduates, one or both working full time, has a better than 95 percent probability of being above the poverty line. That applies to whites, blacks, yellows and browns alike.

The upshot is that the welfare system must get away from handouts for food, shelter, carfare and the like. If the \$226 billion a year the government spends on such welfare entitlements were used instead to provide poor women and men substantial incentives to get high school diplomas, get married and get to work, it would not be long before they lifted themselves from poverty.

#### TIME FOR CONGRESS TO WAKE UP AND SMELL THE GUN SMOKE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, since 1989, the Chinese Army, the Chinese Army, sold 2 million guns to America, and, while China has become the Kmart of guns, America has become the burial ground of the new world order. Meanwhile Congress continues to turn its back.

Let us face it, my colleagues. It is one thing for father and son to go hunting. It is another thing for the Sons of Sam to go into a gun shop and legally outfit an army with AK-47's, Uzis, and cannons.

I think it is time for Congress to wake up and smell the gun smoke all over America, and maybe we will get down to doing our jobs of setting policy, not receiving campaign contributions.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would advise our guests in the gallery that it is against the House rules to demonstrate or take part in activities on the House floor.

#### HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS WHO LOSE THEIR JOBS

(Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would allow employees to prepare for the day when they may find themselves without a job and with no means of paying for their health care needs.

Mr. Speaker, many people have health care coverage in the case of unemployment through COBRA regulations. However, how can we expect a person without a job to pay approximately \$453 per month on health care coverage alone? Clearly this is a situation for which we must plan.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation would allow States to set up programs in which employees could contribute on a voluntary basis a premium in addition to their unemployment taxes which would be used to purchase a health care plan in the case of job loss. Reforming our health care system for the benefit of all Americans must certainly be a top priority. My bill would address one aspect of a much larger problem.

□ 1130

#### SUPPORT VOICED FOR SINGLE-PAYER NATIONAL HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the health care system in America is disintegrating—with 80 million Americans either having no health insurance at all, or with only partial insurance.

And, yet, despite the fact that we are the only major industrialized country on Earth without universal, comprehensive health care we spend far, far more per capita on health care than anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, our system is not in need of Band-Aids or patch work or concepts such as managed competition. We are in need of a new system, which



is why I am delighted to be cosponsoring, with 52 other Members of this House, H.R. 1200, a single-payer, national health care system which, finally, will guarantee comprehensive health care to every man, woman and child in this country without out-of-pocket expenses.

Mr. Speaker, it is only the single payer concept which can save us tens of billions of dollars a year by standing up to the waste and inefficiency in the insurance industry, the greed of the pharmaceutical companies and the excessive income that certain groups of doctors are earning.

The American people believe that health care must be a right of all citizens, and not just a privilege of the wealthy. Let us pass H.R. 1200—the Single Payer, Universal, Comprehensive Health Care Program.

#### FLEXIBLE STANDARDS AND DISCRETION NEEDED IN FEDERAL HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, very recently the First Lady and the Second Lady came to a health care conference in our district at the Penn State Campus. With the opportunity I had to discuss the issues with them there, I asked them to consider in whatever final development there be of a health care plan the role of the States in the overencompassing kind of a health plan everyone is discussing. Each Governor should have the right to apply flexible standards and items of his own choosing in the total picture of the health care system.

Happily for me, attending also at that time to second my motion was Governor Casey of Pennsylvania, who said that in a recent meeting with the President himself, President Clinton acknowledged that any health care plan would involve flexible discretion on the part of the several Governors.

So we should be shying away from a one-payer national system such as some people are advocating because that robs the Governors and the States of that flexibility and discretion so required for a proper health care system.

#### RURAL AMERICA ASKS THAT ALL SHARE IN BUDGET SACRIFICE

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, most of the farmers, the ranchers and the rural residents I have talked to over the past few weeks support the thrust of the President's economic plan. They are willing to be part of a team effort to get this country back on track.

All they ask is that the mix of spending cuts and tax increases we vote on here in Congress be fair.

The trouble is I cannot explain to my rural south Texas constituents—and particularly the farmers and ranchers in my district—why the programs serving their needs are again on the chopping block, but not other programs.

I cannot explain why farmers and ranchers must sacrifice twice—first with budget cuts in farm programs, and then again with an energy tax, and other related taxes that hit agriculture and rural residents harder than almost any other sector of the economy.

Mr. Speaker, agricultural spending has been greatly reduced. Over the past 10 years we have voted on and approved agricultural spending cuts totaling \$48 billion. Just 2 years ago, we cut farm price support spending alone by an estimated 20 percent.

What other entitlement, what other budget function, what other single program has taken this kind of hit?

We want to support the House budget resolution, but we want to see fairness in these budget cuts and tax increases. I urge the Budget Committee and the House to treat rural America fairly.

#### STATE CONTROL OF TVA AND APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION COULD SAVE \$1 BILLION

(Mr. CALVERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the President asked for suggestions for additional cuts in the Federal budget. I have two to suggest.

First, TVA, the Tennessee Valley Authority was started nearly 60 years ago to bring electric power to a poor and rural region of the country.

Second, the Appalachian Regional Commission, this commission was formed nearly 30 years ago to foster economic development in that region.

Both have outlived their original purposes, Mr. Speaker, and it is time to turn their functions back to the States.

This will save the Federal Government more than \$1 billion over 5 years.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CLARENCE MILLER, FORMER OHIO CONGRESSMAN

(Mr. STRICKLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure today, to speak about a distinguished former Member of this body; Mr. Clarence Miller of Ohio. John Gardner has said that some people strengthen the society just by being the kind of people they are. Clarence Miller is such a man.

For 26 years Clarence Miller served this Congress, our Nation, and the people of southeastern Ohio with grace, decency, and honor.

Clarence Miller embodies the qualities which should characterize all of us who aspire to public office. Those who served with him on the House Appropriations Committee can attest to his kindness, hardwork, and determination to do the right thing.

Next week, I will join the chamber of commerce and hundreds of his former constituents to honor him in a special ceremony in Marietta, OH.

Mr. Speaker, Clarence Miller has set a high standard for public service. I have big shoes to fill.

#### SPENDING CUTS

(Mr. QUINN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the constituents of western New York. Before I ask my constituents in western New York, who are hard-working, middle-class families, to send even 1 more penny of taxes to Washington, I want to follow the President's charge to cut spending.

A lot of the new taxes that are being proposed would unduly target families in areas like Buffalo and Erie County, NY, that truly represent the middle-class Americans who work hard to strive for better lives in our country.

Mr. Speaker, just yesterday I received a letter from an autoworker in my district who got the message to me and all of us, I believe: "Cut spending first." The message was in the envelope, and everywhere where there is space the message is: "Cut spending first."

The President has asked for specific cuts, and I join my freshmen colleagues and many others in calling for more specific cuts, for example, in the Rural Electrification Administration, which at one time helped furnish electricity to rural areas. It had great intentions in 1935 when it began, but it has clearly outlived its purpose.

Mr. Speaker, this is one specific cut that could save \$500 million over 5 years.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1993

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to join with my colleagues, Representatives DON EDWARDS, BUD CRAMER, MICHAEL KOPETSKI, JIM RAMSTAD, BOB SMITH, and CHRIS SHAYS, in introducing the National Child Protection Act of 1993. This bill is designed to protect children

from being abused and victimized when they are in child care or involved in youth activities outside their homes.

I want to thank the cosponsors of this legislation for their commitment to ensuring the safety of our Nation's most vulnerable children. I also want to thank the many groups that have responded so positively to this legislative initiative and have provided valuable input. A very special thanks is due to Ms. Oprah Winfrey who has dedicated her energy and talents to focusing the spotlight of public attention on the issue of child abuse.

This legislation will provide grants to States to improve their reporting to the national crime reporting system by providing data on convicted child abusers. States will be able to access the data base to complete background checks on potential and current child care providers and volunteers with youth service organizations. Having access to this data will prevent persons convicted of child abuse crimes from being hired in these settings. The bill authorizes \$20 million in direct Federal assistance to help States to improve the reporting of their criminal justice records. The legislation includes specific timetables so that accurate, up-to-date information on child abuse convictions will be available on a national basis within 3 years. The bill contains safeguards to ensure that information provided is accurate, current, and includes only convictions of abuse.

Child care providers and youth-serving organizations will be able to conduct background checks on current or potential employees or volunteers by making application with the appropriate State agency. The cost of the background check will be borne by the employer or organization seeking the information.

This legislation enjoyed considerable support when it was introduced in the 102d Congress. I hope that my colleagues will join with us today in cosponsoring this initiative.

#### A 7-PERCENT CUT IN PENTAGON BUDGET URGED

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks have passed since the President's State of the Union Address, and it is noteworthy that a majority of Americans and a majority in Congress support this plan.

Indeed, momentum is building to enact this package. Americans appear willing to accept making a larger contribution in Federal taxes, but they are demanding something in return. They are demanding we make real progress in cutting spending and reducing the deficit. That is the deal we are striking with the American public.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read an op-ed in today's New York Times written by two scholars from MIT.

These experts argue that by reducing the Pentagon's budget by 7 percent, we can achieve an additional \$21 billion in spending cuts this year beyond what the President has already requested.

I strongly urge my colleagues on the House Budget Committee to consider these suggestions as they draw up a blueprint for spending cuts next year.

We must take the demands of the American public seriously. We must do everything we can to ensure that the deal we are making with the public is a deal we can keep.

□ 1140

#### TIME FOR TRUTH IN TAXATION

(Mr. GRAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, Jay Leno recently said:

We're lucky these days, it's easier to marry millionaires than it used to be. Because according to Bill Clinton, a millionaire is now anyone who earns more than \$30,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, that would be really funny, if it were not so true.

Candidate Clinton told us he was only going to raise taxes on millionaires. Then, President Clinton told us he was going to raise taxes on everyone who makes over \$30,000.

Now, we find out that is not even the whole story.

In calculating who will bear the burden of the Clinton tax increases, the President is counting such things as home values, IRA's and Keogh plans, pension and life insurance savings, and employee fringe benefits as income.

When you factor that in, the President's new taxes will hit everyone making over \$20,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, counting these things as income is simply wrong, deceptive, and misleading to the American people. And, it could spell real trouble for those people who thought they would not be hit by the President's new taxes.

It is time for truth in taxation. The Congress should reject such gimmicks, and the American people should know what is really going on.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control which I am honored to chair was voted not to be reconstituted and is scheduled to

wrap up its business by the end of this month. I hope that my colleagues might reconsider what we have done, because the move was at that time to try to cut back in our budget expenditures and to save money for the legislative budget by doing that. But it seems to me that one of the messages we are sending is that we have resolved the drug problem as we have seen it.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to talk about the budget and the deficit, we should recognize that the drug and alcohol problem in the United States is costing us over \$300 billion a year when you take into consideration lost revenue, lost productivity, and the fact that we cannot remain competitive unless we deal with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I will return to this floor in asking Members to take a hard look as to whether we are saving money or whether we really want to go after the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control for budgetary reasons.

#### CUTTING GOVERNMENT WASTE

(Mr. McKEON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has come to us asking for specific cuts to be included in his deficit reduction package. I come before you today offering one such cut. Each former Speaker of the House receives a sizable retirement gift at the expense of American taxpayers. That gift has cost us nearly \$4 million in the last 22 years.

The office of the former Speaker was created in 1970 so that former Speakers of the House could wrap up business after leaving office. The sham is that it is up to the former Member to decide when their business is concluded. For example, former Speaker Carl Albert has been conducting his business since 1977, Tip O'Neill since 1987, and Jim Wright since 1989.

Last year the expenses of these three former Speakers cost the taxpayer \$601,000. That averages to about \$200,000 a piece for that year alone, over and above an already sizable personal retirement package.

If the Congress is serious about cutting waste, then perks like giving former Speakers of the House a shiny golden parachute must end. I want to support a serious deficit reduction package, comprised of spending cuts, not new taxes.

My recommendation is that the length of time former Speakers receive this benefit is limited to 1 year. I believe this is sufficient time to wrap up unfinished business on the taxpayers' dole.

#### KEEP AMERICAN JOBS IN AMERICA

(Mr. APPLEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House



for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, if we really want to balance the budget, we have got to do it through jobs, not just taxes, and certainly not with taxes on unemployment compensation, on minimum wage jobs, and on retirement benefits. I am talking about the good jobs that are leaving this country, that are going into other countries of the world who are benefiting from our stupidity; the kind of jobs right now that allow us, our people, to be able to live in and support their community and support their families.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to do this by changing our trade laws. We have got to give America a break and renegotiate the North American Free-Trade Agreement. We have to equalize America's position in the world with these other countries, and penalize those countries who freeze American products out of their system.

Mr. Speaker, it is time America got tough on trade and it is time we brought our jobs back to America. If you want to balance the budget, that is the way to do it.

#### HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT, HEALTHY ECONOMY

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, conservation has become a leading word for many of us. Burdensome environmental regulations in the areas of energy production, industrial manufacturing, and product use has led to job losses, questionable schemes like clean air credits, and no apparent improvement to our environment.

Simply put, we provide regulations without providing the technology to implement them. The result has been a shrinking of the U.S. industrial base, loss of U.S. competitiveness abroad, and loss of jobs at home.

But healthy environment and healthy economy need not be mutually exclusive.

This week I introduced a bill to create a national environmental technologies agency. The purpose of this agency would be to facilitate the development of environmentally safe technologies by assisting the efforts of private industry, universities, nonprofit research centers, and government laboratories in these areas.

Environmental cleanup technology will be a \$1.2 trillion business over the next 10 years. Healthy environment can mean healthy economy.

#### LOWER INTEREST RATES BENEFIT AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, while our Republican colleagues continue to criticize President Clinton's program for economic recovery in this Nation, we see that those individuals who are not involved in politics but are involved in the very tough and difficult decisions of managing other people's money are betting that the Clinton program will make a difference.

Once again today the New York Times reports that bond rates have fallen again to new lows. They have done that because the money managers of this country have determined that the Clinton package is real, that the numbers are real, and that it is an honest package that provides for real deficit reduction over the next 4 years.

Mr. Speaker, what does that mean to our constituents? That means that the American people will be able to go out and be more likely able to afford a home, to refinance their homes to lower their mortgage payments, to buy an automobile at a lower interest rate, and to finance their children's education at a lower interest rate. That is putting real money, real dollars, in the pockets of the American people because of the action that President Clinton took here when he came to this Congress and presented his economic recovery plan. We should stop criticizing it. We should support it and get it on the books, so we can continue to have the benefit flow to this Nation in lower interest rates, so American companies can refinance their debt, and make money available for investment in new jobs and manufacturing.

#### ELIMINATE OUTRAGEOUS PERK

(Mr. INGLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about what the Cleveland Plain Dealer has called a tradition that seems destined to become this year's outrageous perk, and that perk is the perk of allowing departing Members of this House to back up a moving van to their district office and clear it out, to take the furniture and go home with it.

Mr. Speaker, that is this year's outrageous perk. The people of this country, I believe, are looking for real deficit reduction, but they believe that deficit reduction can only start if it starts right here in this House.

I have not been here long, but I have noticed this: I do not see any belt tightening in the House of Representatives. I do not see any cutting back. We must start with deficit reduction right here in this House, and that means eliminating again what the Cleveland Plain Dealer calls "what is destined to become this year's outrageous perk."

#### SIN TAXES WILL NOT RAISE REVENUES

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again state my unequivocal support for the President's plan to reduce the deficit and stimulate the economy. The people of my district have made it clear that they support the President's plan as proposed in his February 17, State of the Union Address. We are concerned, however, about recent proposals to modify his plan with additional cuts and increased taxes on tobacco products, a crop that is not only important, but critical to the economy of my district and region. Recent media reports indicate that revenues from these taxes are on the decline. In New Jersey, the expected taxes on tobacco and alcohol have dropped some \$65 million from 1993 to 1994. In New York, the revenues from tobacco will drop by \$32 million in 1 year. If these trends continue, tax officials predict that cash-poor States and local governments will have to raise other taxes or cut back on services. If the purpose of additional sin taxes is to raise revenues, it will fail based on these revelations.

□ 1150

#### H.R. 4, THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1993

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to notify Members regarding the Rules Committee's plans for H.R. 4, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993.

The Energy and Commerce Committee ordered H.R. 4 reported yesterday by a vote of 34-18. The Rules Committee is planning to meet on H.R. 4 the week of March 8, 1993, to take testimony and grant a rule. It is expected that a request will be made for a structured rule which would permit the offering of only those floor amendments designated in the rule.

Any Member who is contemplating an amendment to H.R. 4 should submit 55 copies of the amendment, along with a brief explanation, to the Rules Committee in H-312 in the Capitol, no later than 12 noon on Monday, March 8, 1993.

It is my understanding that copies of the printed bill may not be available in the document room until after the filing deadline. Consequently, the Energy and Commerce Committee will make available, in their offices, copies of the bill for the use of Members preparing amendments.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today I sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to all offices

detailing the steps Members need to take to protect the right to offer amendments. We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in this effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule for H.R. 4.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, my good chairman, for whom I have great respect.

I just might point out that the NIH report is not going to be filed until sometime around noontime Tuesday, as I understand it. And the gentleman is not saying that it is necessary to have these amendments filed. It would not necessarily preclude other amendments. But he is suggesting Members do have them in.

In other words, the gentleman is not talking about a restrictive, closed rule or anything like that, at this point?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this point I am just asking Members to have the amendments filed in the RECORD.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the gentleman for enlightening the membership.

#### EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-26) on the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 920) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

#### H. RES. 115

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, a motion to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 920) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall be divided for a separate vote on concurring in section 7 of the Senate amendment, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 115 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is, Will the

House now consider House Resolution 115?

The question was taken; and, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the House agreed to consider House Resolution 115.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 115 makes it in order to consider in the House—any rule to the contrary notwithstanding—a motion to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 920 with the Senate amendment, and to agree to the Senate amendment. The Senate substitute is the same as the House bill with the addition of a freeze on Members' pay for calendar year 1994 at this year's level.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate. The rule also automatically divides the question, allowing a separate vote on the last section of the bill, elimination of cost of living adjustment for Members of Congress in 1994. Mr. Speaker, the division is in order any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding.

For Members' information, I am making available a CBO cost estimate and I include it in the RECORD at this point.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, March 4, 1993.

Hon. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,  
Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 920, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993, as passed by the Senate on March 3, 1993.

The bill would affect direct spending and thus would be subject to pay-as-you-go procedures under section 13101 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

C.G. NUCKOLS  
(For Robert D. Reischauer).

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

1. Bill number: H.R. 920.
2. Bill title: The Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993.
3. Bill status: As passed by the Senate on March 3, 1993.
4. Bill purpose: To extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991, and for other purposes.

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
<b>DIRECT SPENDING</b>						
Emergency unemployment compensation:						
Estimated budget authority	3,210.0	2,340.0	0	0	0	0

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS—Continued

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998
Estimated outlays	3,210.0	2,340.0	0	0	0	0
Administrative expenses: <sup>1</sup>						
Estimated budget authority	110.0	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays	110.0	0	0	0	0	0
Railroad unemployment:						
Estimated budget authority	2.5	(2)	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays	2.5	(2)	0	0	0	0
Elimination of cost-of-living adjustment for Members of Congress:						
Estimated budget authority	0	-2.2	-3.0	-3.1	-3.3	-3.4
Estimated outlays	0	-2.2	-3.0	-3.1	-3.3	-3.4
<b>Total direct spending:</b>						
Estimated budget authority	3,322.5	2,337.8	-3.0	-3.1	-3.3	-3.4
Estimated outlays	3,322.5	2,337.8	-3.0	-3.1	-3.3	-3.4
<b>AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED FOR APPROPRIATION</b>						
Administrative expenses:						
Estimated authorization level	0	80.0	0	0	0	0
Estimated outlays	0	80.0	0	0	0	0
Profiling new claimants:						
Estimated authorization level	7.0	19.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Estimated outlays	7.0	19.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
<b>Total discretionary spending:</b>						
Estimated authorization level	7.0	99.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
Estimated outlays	7.0	99.0	7.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

<sup>1</sup> For fiscal year 1993, the administrative expenses would not need any further appropriation action because of language in the Labor-HHS 1993 appropriation bill. The Labor-HHS 1993 appropriation bill makes available an additional \$30 million for every 100,000 increase in the average weekly insured unemployment above 3.54 million.

<sup>2</sup> Less than \$500,000.

The costs of this bill fall within budget functions 600, 800 and 950. The spending effects of the bill are discussed below.

Direct spending: H.R. 920 would extend the current Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 through October 2, 1993. Recipients who file claims by October 2, 1993 could continue to collect emergency unemployment compensation benefits through January 15, 1994. Based on recent program spending, CBO estimates the additional benefit payments from this bill would be \$3.2 billion in fiscal year 1993 and \$2.3 billion in fiscal year 1994. CBO estimates the additional benefit payments through the Railroad Unemployment Insurance program would be \$2.5 million in fiscal year 1993 and less than \$500,000 in fiscal year 1994.

In addition, CBO estimates there would be additional administrative costs of \$190 million to process the additional claims for Extended Unemployment Compensation. Only \$110 million of the \$190 million would be considered direct spending.

H.R. 920 would also eliminate the scheduled January 1994 cost-of-living increase in pay rates for Members of Congress. Cost-of-living adjustments would resume in January of 1995. Members' pay raises are permanently appropriated and therefore would be considered direct spending. The savings from this provision would be \$2.2 million in fiscal year 1994 and \$15 million over the 1994-1998 period.

Amounts authorized for appropriations: H.R. 920 would require the Secretary of Labor to establish a program to encourage all states to implement a system of profiling all new claimants. The profiling system would determine which claimants are most likely to exhaust regular unemployment compensation and therefore, to benefit from reemployment assistance. The bill requires the Secretary of Labor to provide technical assistance and advice to the states as they develop and implement these profiling data



systems. Based on information from the Department of Labor (DOL), CBO estimates that a total of \$20 million would be required over 3 years to develop and implement the automated data systems. In addition, DOL would operate a design center at the federal level. This center would help develop model systems for the states and serve as a resource center for state offices. We estimate a cost of \$3 million in fiscal year 1993 and \$5 million each year in fiscal years 1994 through 1998 for the operation of the design center.

6. Budget enforcement Act considerations: This section discusses how the bill would affect pay-as-you-go procedures and the discretionary spending limits under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (BEA).

Pay-as-you-go: The BEA sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts through 1995. The pay-as-you-go effects of the bill are shown in the following table:

[By fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1993	1994	1995
Outlays .....	3,322.5	2,337.8	-3.0
Receipts .....	(1)	(1)	(1)

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable.

Under section 13101 of the BEA, amounts provided in this bill that have been designated as emergency spending by the President and the Congress do not count against the pay-as-you-go restrictions of that section. In section 6 of this bill, the Congress designates as an emergency any direct spending provided pursuant to this bill. If the President also makes such an emergency designation, amounts pursuant to this bill will not be subject to the pay-as-you-go procedures.

Amounts authorized for appropriation: Under section 13101 of the BEA, amounts authorized to be appropriated that have been designated as emergency spending by the President and the Congress do not count against the spending limits under section 601 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In section 6 of this bill, the Congress designates as an emergency any spending appropriated pursuant to this bill. If the President also makes an emergency designation, amounts appropriated pursuant to this bill will not be counted against the discretionary spending limits.

7. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.

8. Estimate comparison: None.

9. Previous CBO estimate: None.

10. Estimate prepared by: Cory Oltman and Leslie Griffin.

11. Estimate approved by: C.G. Nuckols, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. Speaker, there are 16 million unemployed and underemployed Americans today. Emergency benefits expire on March 6. In 2 days, if we fail to adopt this resolution, millions of Americans will lose the right to file new claims. There is a time for talk and a time for action. Now is the time to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules, for yield-

ing time to me. He has ably explained the provisions of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. I am very happy, indeed, that the Committee on Rules allowed a separate vote on the elimination of cost-of-living adjustments for Members of Congress for 1994. That means, in effect, that the COLA's will not be allowed for Members of the Congress. There would be no increase for 1994.

I think that is good. I think we all must tighten our belts, and get down to the business of reducing our deficit. And a good place to start is right here in this House of Representatives as the other body did last evening.

The Senate passed the emergency unemployment compensation measure last evening without any change in the provisions of the House, other than adding the amendment which I have just discussed.

I do not think we are going to accomplish anything by extending this emergency resolution for unemployment compensation for people who are unemployed. It has been extended many times.

Just think, if we had taken those billions of dollars and put them into programs so that people could have had permanent jobs, I think it would have been self-sufficient. We do not make any progress by helping people unless we provide something for the future.

Twenty-six weeks comes in a hurry, and it will pass in a hurry. And then unless we provide permanent jobs, we will be back where we started from.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I feel that it is time for the House to get down to business so that we can discuss the measure pending.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. I support the bill, including the freeze. But again, while Congress continues to debate unemployment, America continues to lose jobs.

□ 1200

For the record, there are now more government workers in America—State, local, and Federal—than there are factory workers. Congress, more Government workers on the payroll of the taxpayer than there are factory workers being paid in the private sector, paying taxes, helping with this deficit. Think about that.

There is also one major theme, one tenet, one anchor of the Constitution that is the omnibus clause by which we govern ourselves: Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I have a little simple question no one wants to listen to. How can there be life, liberty, and how can we pursue happiness in America without a job?

I am going to vote for the bill, but the American worker wants a pay-

check. They do not want an unemployment compensation draft from the Government.

I am recommending again to this Congress that everybody's ideas on how to incentivize and move America forward be incorporated into this Committee on Ways and Means process, and I am one Member that is prepared to fight for that right. I hope others join in with me.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 111 be laid on the table. This has been agreed to with the minority side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 115, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 920) "An act to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes," with the Senate amendment thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the Senate amendment is considered as read.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993".

#### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Sections 102(f)(1) and 106(a)(2) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164, as amended) are each amended by striking "March 6, 1993" and inserting "October 2, 1993".

(b) MODIFICATION TO FINAL PHASE-OUT.—Paragraph (2) of section 102(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "March 6, 1993" and inserting "October 2, 1993", and

(2) by striking "June 19, 1993" and inserting "January 15, 1994".

(c) Conforming Amendment.—Paragraph (1) of section 101(e) of such Act is amended by striking "March 6, 1993" each place it appears and inserting "October 2, 1993".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks beginning after March 6, 1993.

#### SEC. 3. TREATMENT OF RAILROAD WORKERS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 501(b) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164, as amended) are each amended by striking "March 6, 1993" and inserting "October 2, 1993".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 501(a) of such Act is amended by striking "March 1993" and inserting "October 1993".

(b) TERMINATION OF BENEFITS.—Section 501(e) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "March 6, 1993" and inserting "October 2, 1993", and

(2) by striking "June 19, 1993" and inserting "January 15, 1994".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks beginning after March 6, 1993.

#### SEC. 4. PROFILING OF NEW CLAIMANTS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish a program for encouraging the adoption and implementation by all States of a system of profiling all new claimants for regular unemployment compensation (including new claimants under each State unemployment compensation law which is approved under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (26 U.S.C. 3301-3311) and new claimants under Federal unemployment benefit and allowance programs administered by the State under agreements with the Secretary of Labor), to determine which claimants may be likely to exhaust regular unemployment compensation and may need reemployment assistance services to make a successful transition to new employment.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—The Secretary of Labor shall provide technical assistance and advice to the States in the development of model profiling systems and the procedures for such systems. Such technical assistance and advice shall be provided by the utilization of such resources as the Secretary deems appropriate, and the procedures for such profiling systems shall include the effective utilization of automated data processing.

(c) FUNDING OF ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of encouraging the development and establishment of model profiling systems in the States, the Secretary of Labor shall provide to each State, from funds available for this purpose, such funds as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Within 30 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall report to the Congress on the operation and effectiveness of the profiling systems adopted by the States, and the Secretary's recommendation for continuation of the systems and any appropriate legislation.

(e) STATE.—For purposes of this section, the term "State" has the meaning given such term by section 3306(j)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 5. FINANCING PROVISIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for nonrepayable advances to the account for "Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds" in Department of Labor Appropriations Acts (for transfer to the "extended unemployment compensation account" established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) such sums as may be necessary to make payments to the States to carry out the purposes of the amendments made by section 2 of this Act.

(b) USE OF ADVANCE ACCOUNT FUNDS.—The funds appropriated to the account for "Ad-

vances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds" in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102-394) are authorized to be used to make payments to the States to carry out the purposes of the amendment made by section 2 of this Act.

#### SEC. 6. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.

Pursuant to sections 251(b)(2)(D)(i) and 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Congress hereby designates all direct spending amounts provided by this Act (for all fiscal years) and all appropriations authorized by this Act (for all fiscal years) as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### SEC. 7. ELIMINATION OF COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IN 1994.

(a) COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—Notwithstanding section 601(a)(2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31(2)), the cost of living adjustment (relating to pay for Members of Congress) which would become effective under such provision of law during calendar year 1994 shall not take effect.

(b) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this Act, or an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this Act, or an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we consider the final consideration of the extension of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act, H.R. 920, which is the Senate-passed version itself. I might point out to the membership that the Senate passed the exact similar legislation that we passed last week. They include the extension of the unemployment benefits. The terms are exactly the same, plus the proper filing of the unemployed employees.

The only difference is the freeze on Members' pay at this particular time. We hope that the Members of this institution, the Members of this House, will support this legislation so we can send it on to the President.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] spoke earlier, the unemployment extension benefits will expire on Saturday of this week. We have 48 hours in which to pass this legislation, so it is my hope that we can be very expeditious in this area and move on this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 962

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 962.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I come up here with very mixed emotions. As I said last week when we debated this bill, I wished we could have come here today with an unemployment compensation extension that was paid for. There was a considerable debate in the Senate. Unfortunately, there was more of a debate than there was here in the House, and they had the opportunity to at least discuss an amendment that would have extended the unemployment benefits and not added \$5.7 billion onto the national debt, onto our children's future tax liability, and thereby hurting their economy, thereby hurting their opportunity to have the kind of opportunities that we have in America today.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Senate did not allow Senator BROWN's amendment to go in, that that motion was tabled. It was very unfortunate. It was a very reasonable proposal, one which I wish, frankly, and I give the Senator his due, I wish I would have thought of myself. It was simply including as part of the spending cuts that President Clinton had suggested in his economic stimulus plan, and accelerating that one aspect of it, which was the freeze of cost-of-living adjustments, accelerate that one aspect of it to pay for the entire package. It would have paid for the entire package, to my understanding.

If what I have heard from the other side is accurate, that they are all for the President's stimulus package as a package, and that we have to look beyond the details, and we should just have to vote for this thing because this is the best thing for America, I do not see why we just cannot vote for one aspect of it before the rest. That would have been, I think, a real gesture in good conscience, a gesture that they are serious about passing the entire package and not just what we keep hearing, which is the tax increases and the spending increases, and then again, as we have in the past in this Chamber, deferring on any spending cuts.

We had the opportunity to pass a spending cut and a spending increase. We had the opportunity in the Senate to do it, and the Senate unfortunately did not take advantage of that opportunity. Here in the House we had the very same opportunity last week. We had an opportunity to send the bill back to committee. We had the opportunity to come up with a mechanism to pay for it.



Again, consistent with what I have been seeing in the 2 years that I have been here, we defer. We said:

No, it is too important. We have to go ahead and raise the spending now. We have to consume this spending now, and we have to put off until tomorrow paying the bills.

I found it very interesting to listen to President Clinton here a few weeks ago talk about good and bad spending. He talked about good spending. I sort of likened it to good and bad cholesterol. We all thought all excessive cholesterol was bad. That is not true. Not all excessive cholesterol is bad. There is good cholesterol and there is bad cholesterol.

We found out that not all excessive Government spending is bad. There is good excessive Government spending and there is bad excessive Government spending. The bad excessive Government spending is called consumption spending.

What is consumption spending? Those are basically direct Government benefits being paid out for today; not investment spending, which is spending on future projects like infrastructure, education, things for children, programs for children like vaccinations. That is investment spending.

President Clinton said that is good spending, that that is the kind of spending the Government does not do enough of. I agree with him. We do not do enough investment spending.

He said, "I am going to focus my economic stimulus package and my administration to stop," as he said, "don't stop looking out for tomorrow." If that is his intention, he should come to the Congress with the programs that match his intention. Stop singing the song if you are going to send different music to the Congress. That is not the music he sent here.

What he sent here, what the Secretary of Labor testified for and refused amendments for, was consumption spending: spending now, paying bills later.

That is not what the President said in his speech. That is not what is being sent to the Congress, and any attempt to come clean and pay for this proposal was shoved aside as, "Well, this just is bogging down the process."

This is not gridlock. This is not gridlock; this is called responsible action, paying for the benefits that we want to pay out today. I find this a very troubling moment to be here, to vote again against an unemployment extension which I very much, and as I said before, the past three I did vote for.

We have change in America. Congratulations, we voted for change. The last three extensions were paid for. We now have change. We are not going to pay for this one. As I said last week, I do not believe that is the change that the Ross Perot supporters and a vast number of Americans who voted for the current President were looking for.

We want responsible change. We want positive change. We do not want change for the sake of change to pay off more political debts. This is a bad way to start the economic stimulus package that President Clinton has sent here. This is the same kind of stuff we have been seeing for the past 2 years that I have been here, and it is the kind of stuff that makes Americans sick when they look at this institution.

I hope that over the next few weeks we will be able to get down to some serious business of changing government, changing America, and doing something positive to create economic growth, to streamline government and create more opportunities in America.

This is not a good start. This is a bad start, and I hope that it is something that we can do something about in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to address the unemployment compensation bill now.

Mr. Speaker, if we look at the kinds of benefits, the kinds of opportunities that the Federal Government does provide for people, certainly unemployment compensation is one of those programs where the Government can appropriately help us and help the people to adjust to the dislocation caused by economic change and, in that sense, should be distinguished from other kinds of programs, regulatory and otherwise, in which the Government may actually hurt the economy and deprive us of the opportunity to create jobs for our people.

Mr. Speaker, I always thought it was extremely important to make that kind of distinction between those two kinds of programs, those which actually inhibit the people, inhibit the great, broad American middle class from providing for itself, and those which help the people tide over the dislocation which may be caused by economic change. It is extremely important for us not to stop the economy from changing. It is important for the Government not to so interfere with the processes of the free market that it cannot do what it needs to do to provide the flow of goods and services on which the economy depends.

It is also very important that we recognize the instances when we can intercede on people's behalf and when we can insulate them from the vicissitudes of economic change. I do not think anybody in this House argues about the importance of unemployment compensation as a program to our people or for the appropriate role of the Federal Government in participating with the States in providing for those kinds of benefits.

The problem with this bill, that I saw, was the fact that it may not be

necessary for the Federal Government to take this kind of a role in this kind of a manner, at this time, in order to provide for the people.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the legislation, which the Congress has passed in the last couple of years, allows the States, in cases of high unemployment, to extend benefits on their own behalf and to assume part of that financial partnership with the Federal Government in doing that. There is no reason in a time of high deficits for us to substitute Federal revenue for potential State revenue in these kinds of instances.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, is that if we are going to provide benefits of this kind, as we should, we ought to undertake the effort to pay for them. There is an enormous amount of waste in the Federal budget. To argue otherwise is to defy reality. We spend \$1.5 trillion a year. Five billion dollars, which is the cost of this bill, is less than 1 percent, or a little more than 1 percent, of that budget. To argue that we cannot find that 1 percent in that budget, in order to pay for these benefits which we are extending to people, is to suggest the Federal Government somehow operates more efficiently than the average family, or the average business, in a time of economic crisis. That is a proposition, Mr. Speaker, which I do not like to defend.

So this is an idea which is a good idea in its concept but which, in its execution, is flawed. What we ought to do, if we are going to pass this, Mr. Speaker, is, No. 1, we ought to find the cuts in other parts of the budget so that we can pay for this kind of a program, and we ought to take every opportunity we can to take advantage of the partnership with the States so that we do not have to rely entirely on Federal revenue in paying for these dollars.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the subcommittee chair, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an emergency situation that we are dealing with in our economy, and we have to keep in mind the benefits of the unemployment program.

Yes, it helps individuals, but it also helps their communities and the local economy as well. These are dollars that go from the unemployed worker to the grocery store to pay the grocery bill. It makes the car payment so you do not have defaults on car payments, and the repossessions that go up. That is why this system was designed in the 1930's as part of the recession recovery program back then. The economics are still sound today, however.

But what we have to recognize is that there are some changes in unemployment in our country, that this has been

a different recession and a different recovery. The recovery is different this time than in previous recoveries, because this recovery is not generating the same number of jobs, in the same time, as previous recoveries have. And so there are more workers who are running out of unemployment benefits by thousands and thousands in number than ever before, and not only is the regular unemployment program being exhausted, so, too, are these individuals exhausting the extended benefits programs as well. There is a serious structural problem in the economy.

In this last election, Mr. Speaker, Americans did ask for change. They defeated, at one time, a very popular President, but they defeated him because they wanted change. They wanted to focus on Americans and the problems here at home.

We took an unemployment bill to this floor three times before we actually implemented one, and that is because the first time the President would not recognize that there was a dire emergency in this country and sign the emergency situation. The second time he vetoed the bill, and the third time we took it to the floor, the polls dropped and said that Americans are concerned about not the gulf, they are concerned about their jobs here at home. So we passed a decent extended benefits program.

Well, change is coming about through President Clinton's initiatives. This is part of it. It is not the whole package though.

There is an economic stimulus package that we are working through committee, as well, that will generate the jobs necessary to put these people back to work, but we cannot ignore the fact that people are hurting today.

If you are unemployed, your unemployment rate is 100 percent. It does not matter if you are in Oregon, or Iowa, or New York City. So we have to help these people, help their local communities, and this is the quickest, most efficient way and fastest way that we can do that.

I urge support of this resolution.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman from Oregon, he made the statement that President Bush did not sign the first unemployment extension because he did not want to extend benefits and did not see the emergency.

Now, those are very sensitive words he used. He used the term emergency spending, and that is a term of art here, as the gentleman knows, emergency spending is, which is to waive the Budget Act so we can increase the deficit.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, we did not waive the Budget Act. We paid for that. He signed it into law, but he would not—

Mr. SANTORUM. I reclaim my time.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Go ahead if you do not want to hear the facts.

Mr. SANTORUM. These are the facts. The first time the President vetoed the bill, the first unemployment extension, it was a nonfunded bill. It was not paid for. That is why he vetoed the bill, and the gentleman is right, he did not declare an emergency.

The second unemployment extension was funded, and he signed it. He did not veto any second unemployment extension. The third one he threatened veto when we passed something here in the House that never even passed in the Senate. We passed something in the House that was not funded, and the only time the President said he was not going to sign an emergency extension was when it was not funded. That is the point I was trying to make.

If you voted for change, you got it, because this President does not care if things are funded. This President just cares if, you know, to continue the same old saga which is, let us dole out more benefits and worry about later on whether we are going to pay for these things or not.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. KOPETSKI. I refer to the committee report where it shows that we did pass on August 17, 1991, and the President signed into law, but he did not declare the emergency as part of that because he did not want to recognize that there were unemployed people in America.

Mr. SANTORUM. Reclaiming my time, because by declaring an emergency, he would have added to the deficit, because we did not pass a bill that was funded. You can play all of these kinds of procedural tricks, but, I mean, the fact of the matter is, he did not approve and execute the bill, in other words, make it effective, because it would have added several billion dollars to the deficit, and that is the kind of change, and that is the kind of leadership, that I think we need in this country. We need someone, as Ross Perot came up here and said on Capitol Hill, and is running around this country getting throngs of people listening to his message, and I hope that maybe some people on this side of the aisle would listen to that message:

We are sick and tired of the same old "let us go ahead and add to the deficit, let us go ahead and do the politically popular thing, and then let us pay for it later."

□ 1220

That is the kind of stuff that folks are tired of. That is exactly what we are doing today. There is nothing but that.

Now, I know that there was an amendment in the Senate. Senator MITCHELL, I am sure in very good faith, put forward an amendment to partially pay for this bill by freezing our cost of living. As a Member who does not take pay raises, you can freeze all the cost of living's you want for as long as I am here. But the fact of the matter is, the fact of the matter is this only comes up with \$2 million this year.

Now, I will remind you that the bill costs \$5.7 billion. Now, we came up with a \$2 million funding mechanism. Now, that is a bit disingenuous. That to me is not really addressing the issue, which is, "Where is the beef?"

Where is the funding? Where is the money that we are going to come up with so that we do not continue to put burdens on our children, on your children, all of our children and grandchildren to come? That is not the kind of responsibility that I want to be a part of and that this Congress should be a part of.

I have all the compassion in the world for people who are unemployed, no matter what city they live in. But I have compassion for future generations, too. We seem to forget that here.

You know, as the President says, "Don't stop thinking about tomorrow." I think about tomorrow a lot. There are a lot of Members on this side who think about tomorrow. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if the President wants to continue to think about tomorrow, that he sends music to this Chamber which sings that tune. The music that he sent to this chamber about unemployment does not sing that tune, it sings "Happy days are here today." That is not what we came here to do. We came here to look out for the future of this country.

Mr. KOPETSKI. If the gentleman would yield, thank you, it sounds like the gentleman is all ready to sign up for the President's stimulus program. That is No. 1. I look forward to the gentleman's support on that program.

No. 2, the gentlemen talks about the same old saws, the same older leadership. The people of America turned out a President who refused to look at them today and the suffering they are having today. This is a package. Yes; we have to look at tomorrow, but, yes, we also have to consider the suffering that goes on in families today. These people are not just statistics. These are people who have children, they want to go to school, they want food on the table, they want to make the car payment, the mortgage payment. The gentleman is saying, "Don't worry about it, don't worry about them today."

Mr. SANTORUM. No; that is not correct.

Mr. KOPETSKI. We have to worry about them today.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Mr. KOPETSKI. So that is why we ought to fund this bill—



The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time is controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. The gentleman mischaracterizes, again, my comments.

Mr. KOPETSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. KOPETSKI. The gentleman is—

Mr. WALKER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] controls the time.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat for at least the dozen times I have said this today, and I will say it one more time, I am for extending unemployment benefits. I have the same compassion for these people today as the gentleman does. What I am saying is—and no one on this side of the aisle, no one came to the well, no one came to the well and said we should not extend unemployment benefits; nobody. Every argument on this floor from this side of the aisle was that we should pay for any extension of benefits. That is the only argument that has been on the floor for the past 2 weeks.

Now, to continue to mischaracterize that, again, I understand it is a place for sound bites, but it does not address the issue. The issue is are we going to do the compassionate thing—and, I would suggest, the right thing—by extending unemployment benefits, or are we going to do it in a responsible manner? That is all that I—the point that I tried to make. I have consistently made that point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, in this piece of legislation that we are considering, we are freezing the cost-of-living adjustment for Members of Congress for 1994.

Now I want to remind all of my colleagues that in May of last year the people of America ratified the 27th Amendment. For those of you who may not remember the 27th Amendment, it says very simply that no law that varies the compensation for the services of Senators and Representatives can become effective without an intervening election. Pointed very straightforwardly, trying to reduce our pay in the manner in which we are doing it, by not accepting the COLA in 1994, is unconstitutional. It is unconstitutional to pass the amendment that was put on this in the Senate last night.

All of us were elected to this Chamber swearing to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Now, if we want to do the right thing, we should eliminate the 1989 Ethics in Government Act, that section of the law that granted COLA's ad infinitum, so that the Congress never again has to vote

on a pay raise. We could do that. It would not be effective until 1995. But we could eliminate all of those. But instead of doing what is right and doing what makes sense long term by eliminating COLA's, we did the only year that under the Constitution that we cannot change, and that is the 1994 COLA increase.

So I would urge my colleagues that when you have to vote on this amendment, which we are going to have a separate vote on, the fact that we want to look like we are all doing the fighting for our constituents by avoiding the pay raise, under the Constitution, we are not allowed.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. I would just like to say that this bill before us now is the same bill that was passed last week out of the House of Representatives by a rather substantial vote. The only addition is the pay freeze on this legislation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation extending unemployment compensation. When we pass this legislation today we will be approving the first element of the President's economic plan.

This legislative victory demonstrates that when Congress and the White House work together we can bring fresh, innovative thinking to the rescue of America's unemployed.

Not only does this legislation extend benefits, it also contains a new provision for profiling.

Profiling programs use data collected from beneficiaries to determine whether individual workers are permanently displaced and therefore need retraining, counseling or other assistance to find new jobs. When Secretary of Labor Reich saw how the State pilot programs or profiling have worked, he included it in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, because we are in a jobless recovery, today's legislation is necessary. However, it underscores the need for approval of the President's economic plan for long-term growth which puts people back to work.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and commend the committee for bringing this fresh approach to the floor.

Ms. E.B. JOHNSON, of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last month, in my State of Texas, unemployment rose an entire percentage point to nearly 8½ percent—and in some neighborhoods of my district the percentages are much worse. The reality behind the statistics is that over 727,000 Texans are without work—people and families, just like yours and mine, who are desperately trying to hold together until next week or next month when there might be a job at their factory, at their auto plant, or anywhere at all. And there are millions more across our Nation who tell similar stories of mass layoffs, plant closings, company bankruptcies, and financial ruin. Today, here in the House, we have voted to extend emergency unemployment compensation until October of this year. For the estimated 2 million workers who will benefit from this extension, this legis-

lation is a godsend. They aren't asking for our pity or charity, just a helping hand until President Clinton's economic recovery brings back jobs to our cities and States.

Yes, this program is expensive—and for new Members like me it's very difficult to vote for programs with big price tags, when I came here to help cut nonessential Government spending. But emergency unemployment compensation extension is not like the pork barrel Government projects that we've vowed to eliminate—this bill is a targeted investment in unemployed American workers, linked with a new reemployment network to help people get back on their feet with another job. I thank my colleagues for voting to extend unemployment benefits, but also strongly urge them to quickly pass an economic stimulus package that will put people back to work so that this is the last time we extend emergency unemployment compensation.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to express my strong, strenuous support for freezing congressional pay. Our national debt is currently over \$4 trillion and the deficit for this year alone is expected to be over \$330 billion. I believe it is absolutely unconscionable for Members of Congress to accept an automatic salary increase in the face of this outrageous deficit. Congress simply must take decisive action to seriously reduce Government spending in all areas of Government. A good first start would be for Members of Congress to set the example by freezing their own pay.

During my 12 years in the Pennsylvania State Legislature, I voted against every pay raise measure. Unfortunately, today, I am required to testify on an important matter in Federal court in Philadelphia and am unable to cast my vote in favor of the pay freeze measure. This suit, of which I am the chief plaintiff, seeks to overturn a decision by the Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania which, in effect, disenfranchises voters in Bucks County by delaying the special election for my former State Senate seat until July of this year. I cannot stand by and allow my constituents in Bucks County to be without a voice in the Pennsylvania State Senate for nearly 7 months. I must do all within my means to see that the Lieutenant Governor's decision is not allowed to stand.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, despite the good pay freeze amendment adopted by the Senate to H.R. 920, the emergency unemployment compensation extension, it remains overall a bad bill. It needlessly adds to the Federal budget deficit and, for that reason, I continue to oppose it.

When the Senate considered H.R. 920, it added an amendment that would prohibit Members of Congress from receiving a cost-of-living-adjustment [COLA] in 1994. I wholeheartedly support the amendment as the first step in reining in congressional spending and doing our part toward deficit reduction.

But for the 103d Congress, the extension of unemployment benefits in H.R. 920 is our first test of fiscal discipline, and by passing the bill we fail that test, while asking the American family to suffer the consequences of adding nearly \$6 billion to the Federal budget deficit. The message from our constituents has been loud and clear—are we ever going to listen?

They are tired and frustrated with Congress' fiscal irresponsibility, and with H.R. 920 we are only giving them more of the same disgusting performance.

It is even more disappointing to know that we could have brought this bill to the floor and debated amendments that would have provided the means to pay for the extension of unemployment benefits. But those amendments were defeated on a party line vote in the Ways and Means Committee and weren't allowed by the Rules Committee to be offered on the House floor.

Obviously, the bulldozer is in high gear, but it's pushing a bill that is not needed. Granted, unemployment remains a problem in some States, but just last year we passed legislation allowing those States with problems to extend benefits without Federal action. With the economy in recovery, H.R. 920 is not needed and spends Federal dollars we simply can't afford.

I'm pleased that Congress is on record for freezing its pay for 1994, but that action was lost in the passage of H.R. 920 with its \$6 billion price tag. We saved a few million to only fall billions more behind.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 115, the previous question is ordered on the motion, and pursuant to House Resolution 115, the question on concurring in the Senate amendment will be divided.

The first question before the House is on concurring in sections 1 through 6 of the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 247, nays 156, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—247

Abercrombie	Brooks	Darden
Ackerman	Browder	de la Garza
Andrews (ME)	Brown (CA)	DeFazio
Andrews (NJ)	Brown (FL)	DeLauro
Andrews (TX)	Brown (OH)	Dellums
Applegate	Byrne	Derrick
Bacchus (FL)	Cantwell	Deutsch
Baesler	Cardin	Diaz-Balart
Barlow	Chapman	Dicks
Barrett (WI)	Clay	Dixon
Becerra	Clyburn	Dooley
Beilenson	Coleman	Durbin
Bentley	Collins (GA)	Edwards (CA)
Berman	Collins (IL)	Emerson
Bevill	Collins (MI)	Engel
Bilbray	Condit	English (AZ)
Bishop	Conyers	Eshoo
Blackwell	Cooper	Evans
Blute	Coppersmith	Everett
Boehlert	Costello	Fazio
Borski	Coyne	Fields (LA)
Boucher	Cramer	Filner
Brewster	Danner	Fingerhut

Fish	Maloney	Rowland
Flake	Manton	Roybal-Allard
Foglietta	Margolies-	Sabo
Ford (MI)	Mezvinsky	Sanders
Frank (MA)	Markey	Sangmeister
Frost	Martinez	Sarpallus
Furse	Matsui	Sawyer
Gallo	Mazzoli	Schenk
Gedjenson	McCloskey	Schroeder
Gephardt	McDermott	Schumer
Gibbons	McHale	Scott
Gilchrest	McHugh	Serrano
Gillmor	McKinney	Sharp
Gilman	Meehan	Shepherd
Glickman	Meek	Sisisky
Gonzalez	Menendez	Skaggs
Gordon	Mfume	Skelton
Green	Mineta	Slattery
Hall (OH)	Mink	Slaughter
Hamburg	Moakley	Smith (IA)
Hamilton	Molinari	Smith (NJ)
Harman	Mollohan	Snowe
Hastings	Moran	Solomon
Hayes	Morella	Spratt
Hefner	Murphy	Stark
Hilliard	Murtha	Stokes
Hinchey	Nadler	Studds
Hoagland	Natcher	Stupak
Hochbrueckner	Neal (MA)	Swett
Hoekstra	Neal (NC)	Synar
Holden	Oberstar	Tanner
Horn	Obey	Tauzin
Hoyer	Oliver	Tejeda
Hughes	Ortiz	Thornton
Jacobs	Orton	Thurman
Johnson (CT)	Owens	Torkildsen
Johnson, E.B.	Pallone	Torres
Johnston	Pastor	Torricelli
Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)	Towns
Kaptur	Payne (VA)	Traffant
Kennedy	Pelosi	Unsoeld
Kennelly	Peterson (FL)	Upton
Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Velazquez
Kleccka	Pickle	Vento
Klink	Pomeroy	Visclosky
Kopetski	Poshard	Volkmer
Kreidler	Price (NC)	Walsh
LaFalce	Quinn	Washington
Lambert	Rahall	Waters
Lancaster	Rangel	Watt
Lantos	Reed	Waxman
LaRocco	Regula	Wheat
Lehman	Reynolds	Whitten
Levin	Richardson	Williams
Lewis (GA)	Ridge	Wise
Lipinski	Roemer	Woolsey
Lloyd	Rogers	Wyden
Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn
Lowey	Rose	Yates
Machtley		

NAYS—156

Allard	Dickey	Hutchinson
Archer	Doolittle	Hutto
Armey	Dornan	Hyde
Bacchus (AL)	Dreier	Inglis
Baker (CA)	Duncan	Inhofe
Baker (LA)	Dunn	Isles
Ballenger	Edwards (TX)	Istook
Barrett (NE)	English (OK)	Johnson (GA)
Bartlett	Ewing	Johnson (SD)
Barton	Fawell	Johnson, Sam
Bateman	Fowler	Kasich
Bereuter	Franks (CT)	Kim
Billrakis	Franks (NJ)	King
Billey	Gallely	Kingston
Boehner	Gekas	Klug
Bonilla	Gingrich	Knollenberg
Bunning	Goodlatte	Kolbe
Burton	Goodling	Kyl
Buyer	Goss	Laughlin
Callahan	Grams	Lazio
Calvert	Grandy	Leach
Camp	Gunderson	Levy
Canady	Hall (TX)	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Hancock	Lewis (FL)
Clement	Hansen	Lightfoot
Clinger	Hastert	Linder
Coble	Hefley	Livingston
Combust	Herger	Mann
Crane	Hobson	Manzullo
Crapo	Hoke	McCandless
Cunningham	Houghton	McCollum
Deal	Huffington	McCrery
DeLay	Hunter	McCurdy

McInnis	Porter	Smith (OR)
McKeon	Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)
McMillan	Quillen	Spence
Meyers	Ramstad	Stearns
Mica	Ravenel	Stenholm
Michel	Roberts	Stump
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Sundquist
Minge	Roth	Talent
Montgomery	Royce	Taylor (MS)
Moorhead	Santorum	Taylor (NC)
Myers	Saxton	Thomas (CA)
Nussle	Schaefer	Thomas (WY)
Oxley	Schiff	Vucanovich
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Walker
Parker	Shaw	Weldon
Penny	Shays	Wolf
Petri	Shuster	Young (FL)
Pickett	Skeen	Zeliff
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—27

Barcia	Geren	Rostenkowski
Bonior	Greenwood	Roukema
Bryant	Gutierrez	Rush
Carr	Henry	Strickland
Clayton	Jefferson	Swift
Cox	Klein	Tucker
Dingell	McDade	Valentine
Fields (TX)	Miller (CA)	Wilson
Ford (TN)	Paxon	Young (AK)

□ 1247

So sections 1 through 6 of the Senate amendment to H.R. 920 were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair will advise the Members that the question, having been divided, now before the House is on concurring in section 7 of the Senate amendment which, the Chair advises, deals with the cost-of-living adjustment.

The question, therefore, is on concurring in section 7 of the Senate amendment to H.R. 920.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 0, answered "present" 3, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—403

Abercrombie	Beilenson	Burton
Ackerman	Bentley	Buyer
Allard	Bereuter	Byrne
Andrews (ME)	Berman	Calvert
Andrews (NJ)	Bevill	Camp
Andrews (TX)	Bilbray	Canady
Applegate	Billrakis	Cantwell
Archer	Bishop	Cardin
Armey	Blackwell	Carr
Bacchus (FL)	Bliley	Castle
Bacchus (AL)	Blute	Chapman
Baesler	Boehlert	Clay
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Clement
Baker (LA)	Borski	Clinger
Ballenger	Boucher	Clyburn
Barlow	Brewster	Coble
Barrett (NE)	Brooks	Coleman
Barrett (WI)	Browder	Collins (GA)
Bartlett	Brown (CA)	Collins (IL)
Barton	Brown (FL)	Collins (MI)
Bateman	Brown (OH)	Combust
Becerra	Bunning	Condit



Conyers  
Cooper  
Coppersmith  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Darden  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dorman  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (TX)  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (AZ)  
English (OK)  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Fingerhut  
Fish  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Grams  
Grandy  
Green  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamburg  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings  
Hayes  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Henger  
Hilliard  
Hinche  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden

Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Huffington  
Hughes  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Ingalls  
Inhofe  
Inslee  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Kleczka  
Klein  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kopetski  
Kreidler  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lambert  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lehman  
Levin  
Levy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Long  
Lowey  
Machete  
Mann  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Margolis  
Mezvinsky  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McCurdy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McMillan  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinari

Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nadler  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (NC)  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Penny  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pickle  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Reed  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Ridge  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Rowland  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Sarpaluis  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schenk  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shepherd  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark

Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sundquist  
Swett  
Swift  
Synar  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tausin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas (CA)

Thomas (WY)  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Trafcant  
Unsoeld  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Vielosky  
Volkmmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh

Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weldon  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

things which enhance the welfare and prosperity of this great Nation.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 53 and 54 on H.R. 920 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 53 and 54 on H.R. 920 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 53 on H.R. 920 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, during the vote on rollcall No. 54, I was in the Senate in a meeting and missed the vote. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, during the vote on rollcall No. 54, I was in the Senate in a meeting and missed the vote. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, today, during consideration of the legislation to extend unemployment compensation benefits, I inadvertently missed rollcall vote No. 53.

As a strong supporter of the legislation to provide additional unemployment benefits from March 6 to October 2, I would like the RECORD to show that I would have voted in favor of the legislation. It is critical that those unemployed workers who have exhausted their 26 weeks of regular unemployment benefits continue to be eligible to receive additional benefits based on the level of unemployment in their State. I strongly support this extension.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I unavoidably missed rollcall vote No. 54, the emergency unemployment benefits extension. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

#### NOES—0

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Boehner Smith (IA) Washington

#### NOT VOTING—24

Barcia Fields (TX) Paxton  
Bonior Ford (TN) Rostenkowski  
Bryant Geren Roukema  
Callahan Greenwood Strickland  
Clayton Henry Tucker  
Cox Jefferson Valentine  
Dingell Maloney Wilson  
Everett McDade Young (AK)

#### □ 1304

So section 7 of the Senate amendment to H.R. 920 was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 920 which extended the emergency unemployment compensation program until October 2, 1993. A further provision in this bill froze the annual cost-of-living adjustment for fiscal year 1994. This legislation was a truly progressive step in light of the prevailing circumstances facing American lawmakers.

I regret that I was unable to record my vote for this bill due to unfortunate conditions. Because of a longstanding commitment, I was in North Carolina addressing a group of peanut growers and farm cooperatives. My scheduled travel plans would have allowed me to return in Washington with enough time to cast my vote on this matter. However, due to high winds and rain, my flight was delayed precipitating my late arrival in Washington, DC.

I want to emphasize to my constituents, my colleagues, and the American people that I deeply support this legislation. I voted on an earlier version which was submitted to the Senate and subsequently amended and returned to the House. In light of our current economic and fiscal dilemma, I believe that the extension of unemployment benefits is a sensible step to alleviate the misfortune of those who have found themselves displaced by hard economic times. In addition, I am pleased to see that Congress has taken a position of leadership by making a sensible decision to share the needed sacrifice through the freeze in the cost-of-living increases for congressional salaries.

As a new Member of Congress, I am proud to save the needs of both North Carolina's First District and the Nation. It is my sincere desire that Congress will continue to do those

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader, to enlighten the membership on the schedule for the remainder of the day and next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There are no more votes today. Business has been completed. There will not be votes tomorrow.

On Monday, March 8, the House will meet at noon. There will not be legislative business. Tuesday, March 9, the House will meet at noon to consider a bill on suspension, H.R. 490, to convey certain lands to the Columbia Hospital for Women.

On Wednesday, March 10, and probably Thursday, March 11, we will be meeting at 2 on Wednesday and at 11 a.m. on Thursday to take up H.R. 4, which is the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act, subject to a rule.

On Friday, the House will meet at 11. There will not be legislative business.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I might just inquire of the majority leader, I see one suspension vote on Tuesday, but there is a likelihood that there could be votes on Tuesday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is correct. There could be votes on that day, and Members should expect that.

We obviously also have activity going on in the many committees that will be necessary.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader. The majority leader also mentioned that the NIH bill might be coming up on Wednesday.

I would point out that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], chairman of the Committee on Rules, had announced that he would appreciate amendments being filed by a Monday noontime deadline. I would point out that the Committee on Energy and Commerce tells me that they probably will not have their report filed until Tuesday noon.

I would also hope that the membership is not bound to have amendments in before we have had the opportunity to read it, although we will make every effort to have amendments in by noon.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman is saying. We will consult with the chairman. There may be an update on that decision.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 8, 1993

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### NRA OPPOSES BRADY BILL, SEEKS TO DISCREDIT ATTORNEY GEN- ERAL NOMINEE RENO

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today's recall article about efforts by the NRA and others to discredit Attorney General nominee Janet Reno can only be described as stomach turning. It shows the despicable depths to which the NRA and others are willing to descend to try to stop the Brady bill and other gun control measures from becoming law.

The article reports that unsubstantiated rumors attempting to smear Ms. Reno have been passed to the Senate Judiciary Committee and to the press. Everyone agrees that there is no substantiation and no truth to these rumors but that does not stop the NRA from spreading them. Truth and the NRA have never been very close companions.

What everyone does know to be the truth is that Janet Reno supports the Brady bill. When Janet Reno becomes Attorney General she will be the first sitting Attorney General in history to support the Brady bill. And the NRA can't stand that. The NRA is so scared of a Justice Department in support of the Brady bill that it is willing to spread lies and innuendo in an effort to ruin the sterling reputation of the woman about to become the Nation's highest law enforcement officer.

Shame on them, Mr. Speaker. And shame on anyone else who stoops that low.

#### RECOGNIZING HEROIC SACRIFICE OF BATF SPECIAL AGENTS IN WACO, TX

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) to recognize the heroic sacrifice of the special agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in Waco, TX.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for the purpose of explaining his request.

□ 1310

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that was passed by the Senate, a resolution that I have introduced, along with a number of other Members of this House on both sides of the aisle.

The Senate resolution mirrors the House resolution, which is to recognize the heroic sacrifice of the special agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms who recently lost their lives on the 28th in Waco, TX, in an effort to clear out the radical residents of that compound.

Mr. Speaker, I made the point the other day that keeping law and order is a dangerous endeavor at best. I pointed out, and the resolution points out, that over 184 agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms have lost their lives since the 1860's, when it was formed. This honor roll now includes the four agents killed in Texas on February 28.

Mr. Speaker, let me again intone their names, young men, dedicated to the proposition that law and order will be maintained in this, the freest Nation on the face of the Earth; they were fighters for democracy and freedom, and they lost their lives in the ongoing effort to maintain freedom, democracy, and justice in this Nation: Special Agent Steve Willis, of the Bureau's Houston post; Special Agent Robert J. Williams, of Little Rock, AR; and Special Agents Conway LeBleu and Todd McKeehan of New Orleans.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution passed by the Senate, and now I hope to be shortly passed by us, is but a very small token of the respect, of the admiration, and of the sorrow reflected by the Representatives of the American people who serve on this floor and the gratitude that each of us feels, and the awareness that each of us has that the contributions of these young men and of their colleagues are critical if free men and free women are to continue to enjoy the benefits of a free society.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and would suggest that perhaps he might yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], who represents the area of Waco.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a privilege to be able to



speak in support of this resolution, and want to commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for his leadership on this resolution. It is my belief that the greatness of America lies in the quite compassion and courage of average citizens, citizens who act unselfishly day in and day out in service to others, citizens who never expect to see their faces on television or their names in newspaper headlines.

Such is the case with agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. Every day ATF agents all across America put their lives on the line for us. Without fanfare they take on drug dealers and illegal gunrunners, never knowing if their next raid will, in fact, be their last.

On Sunday, millions of Americans saw the unforgettable image of ATF agents being met with a lethal hail of bullets as they climbed the roof of John Howell's Mount Carmel compound in my district in Texas.

On Monday at a hospital nearby, I met seven of those ATF agents wounded in the raid. In their minds, they simply had done their duty. In my mind, they are modern-day heroes, not only those seven agents but the four who were killed and all ATF agents all across America who exhibit quite courage each and every day.

ATF agents, along with their selfless families, epitomize the very meaning of public service. Unlike our troops returning home from Desert Storm, they will not be welcomed home with parades and confetti. However, from this terrible tragedy in Texas, Mr. Speaker, Americans everywhere have gained a new appreciation for the job of ATF agents. We owe a deep debt of gratitude to all of those agents. It is your quite courage, it is your unselfish service, that have once again shown us the very best in America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I rise to join the chairman of our Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], in support for the resolution that is before us.

As I said in my remarks yesterday when this resolution was introduced, we here in Congress must make it our business to honor the work of law enforcement officials that are willing to make that ultimate sacrifice in the name of law and order. I think this resolution takes a step toward fulfilling that obligation by at least commemorating the efforts of the four Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms agents who gave their lives in that standoff against the religious extremists in Waco, TX.

Also, our feelings go out to the people who live in Waco. Having lived just

a few miles up the road from Waco a few years back, there are a lot of good people in Texas who I am sure are extremely disturbed by the happenings that are going on there.

In addition to that, in the last few days we find many have questioned the tactics employed by the BATF in this confrontation. We live in an age where events still unfolding are given supposedly a definitive instant analysis by the news and others. People who do not know the situation in Waco somehow feel they are qualified to offer an opinion on what should or should not have been done.

What the BATF must focus on now, and I think what we should all be supporting, is ending this tragedy without further bloodshed. We must not forget the agents who are in Waco ready to make the same sacrifice that Steve Willis, Robert J. Williams, Conway LeBleu, and Todd McKeehan and those other agents who have already been wounded there have made. Still many are there putting their lives on the line.

Through this measure we will show the loved ones of those agents who have been slain and wounded that we have not forgotten, that their contributions will not go unnoticed or without honor.

As a member of the subcommittee which oversees BATF, and as a former member of the law enforcement community, I am very proud of these men and their families.

This Congress and this Nation owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to all the members of BATF for what they do every day to make our streets and our communities safer. I do not think that most people realize that in BATF's mission they deal with the most dangerous of criminals. Many times we do not hear about their efforts, and that is because they do such a good job.

We owe very special thanks to the men and women involved in this operation currently underway in Waco. Again, I thank the chairman for his work on this valuable and needed resolution, and urge all my colleagues in the House to support the measure.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement, which I thought was one certainly that I agree with 100 percent, and thank him for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSENTHAL], the gentlemen from Texas [Mr. ARCHER and Mr. PICKLE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUGHES], of the full committee and the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], the

chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who both had jurisdiction over this matter and who have let it go forward in such an expeditious manner, out of respect and honor for these brave agents.

The gentleman raised in his statement the observation that there is an inclination to second guess the actions of the ATF in this instance, or the actions of any individual organization, when loss of life or significant injury occurs as a result of an action.

It is tragic when, as a result of the carrying out of one's duties, loss of life occurs. As I pointed out earlier, 184 agents have, in fact, lost their lives since the 1860s. It is a short distance from this Chamber to Judiciary Square here in the District of Columbia, to a law enforcement memorial that has over, I believe, 12,000 names on it of law enforcement officials who, since the founding of our country, have lost their lives in the performance of their duties.

□ 1320

It is a stark and sad but incontrovertible fact that those in the Armed Forces and those in our domestic defense corps, as I refer to them, are at risk, and being at risk from time to time will pay the ultimate price. But it is important for us to remember this: The four agents who lost their lives were members of ATF's elite, special operations teams. These are the teams that take on the most hazardous jobs of apprehending armed and dangerous criminals.

Last year ATF's special operations teams went into action, Mr. Speaker, more than 230 times without the loss of life in the process of bringing to justice many vicious criminals. Also, last year, investigations by ATF's small force of 2,200 agents caused charges to be brought against more than 13,000 bombers, arsonists, gunrunners, dope dealers, and other dangerous offenders.

We have asked them to confront some of the most dangerous, irrational and unstable elements of our society. They are at risk and they pay the price. Let us always remember them, their families, and the organizations that they serve and the country that they love.

I thank the gentleman for continuing to yield.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I thank the gentleman and appreciate the additional information he added. I think he points out really how little most people comprehend what ATF is up against. And personally, it is very galling to me that someone, because they have a microphone on the airwaves, or a computer and writes to the newspapers, who were not there, who have never been trained, who know nothing about the operation, suddenly come forth with all of their own wonderful illumination of what happened, when in reality they know

very, very little. And I think it is a disservice not only to those men but to our country as a whole that we get off into that kind of a debate not armed with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who lost one of the agents out of his district is on his way to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, while the gentleman from Louisiana is on his way, one of the ironies of this event is the subcommittee which I chair and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] is the ranking minority member, also oversees the Secret Service, and one of the young men who lost their life is the son of an agent of the Secret Service of the United States. So this is a family that has committed itself to the defense of lives and liberty in this country, and that family continues to serve after paying such a very high price. The loss of a child, in my opinion, is almost incomprehensible for a parent. That agent was not there, but we send out as well our sympathy to him in particular as well as all of the other families. I hope the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], will arrive because to have in your district and to visit, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], did earlier this week the individuals, when you see the persons, and they are not statistics, it is not 400 or 500, it is an individual, a fellow citizen who has the courage and the commitment to participate in what is critical to maintaining a free society.

I see our colleague from Louisiana has arrived on the floor, and again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of the right to object, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank my colleagues for their indulgence, because I definitely wanted to be here on the floor to speak on behalf of this resolution and to make note of the fact that the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Office, in which worked most of the wounded and killed was in my district, in the very same office building in which my own district office is located. These fine young people were doing their job, and in the course of that effort several of them have given their lives and others have been critically wounded.

In any event, if they survive or if they did not, their families are going to live with this tragedy throughout their entire lives. I just want to say my heart goes out to those who were killed or wounded, to all of their families from my wife, my family, my constituents, and all of southeast Louisiana in which their office was. Not all of these folks actually lived in southeast Lou-

isiana. They were scattered around between Texas, Louisiana, Tennessee, and Mississippi. But they were all fine people who were dedicated to the job for which their agency was created, and that is trying to make the streets of our cities and our communities and our States as safe as can possibly be.

Unfortunately, they were soldiers who fell in battle, and we can only say that they deserve our greatest and warmest thanks and praise for their efforts. And we can offer at the same time our best hopes and wishes that this will not have to happen again.

I do not know that it would have made much difference in this instance, but coincidentally, 2 hours ago we had a press conference about a bill that I have introduced into this body, H.R. 93, which is intended to rid the streets of those habitual violent offenders who time and time again take advantage or intrude on the rights of their neighbors. That bill known as the LIFER bill, which is an acronym for life imprisonment for egregious recidivist, is a simple and straight forward criminal bill of sorts which says that if any single person is convicted of three violent felonies, the first two being in State or Federal jurisdiction, but if the third is in Federal jurisdiction he would have then been declared three strikes and you are out, and he would be sent to prison for the rest of his natural life. Any person who impinges on the rights of his neighbors violently, threatens his neighbors or threatens the use of force, or uses force against his neighbors three times really does not deserve our compassion and should go to prison forever.

In this case, unfortunately, this bill probably would not have had much of an effect because the perpetrators in this case, for the most part, as much as we know today, had not had previous convictions. So it would not have saved these men had those persons been convicted under this law and ultimately suffered the penalties.

But violence predominates now throughout America and it is one of our worst problems that confront the country. And we depend as a Nation and as a people upon the good efforts of our law enforcement officers.

I was a criminal prosecutor for 6 out of 9 years that I practiced law before I came to Congress. I felt that law enforcement was more worthy of my efforts than the private practice of law. I felt a sense of accomplishment, and I believed in what I was doing.

□ 1330

But in those 6 years, I came to become aware of the sacrifices that are made by law enforcement officers, local, State, and Federal, on a daily basis. They put their lives on the line every single day, and sometimes those sacrifices are called, and sometimes they are wounded and sometimes they are killed.

There is no easy explanation. There is no excuse for what happened here, and all we can do is hope that it will not happen again.

But we can tip our hats, and we can send our praise and our thanks to the families of these brave people who have given their lives to make this a safer country for all of us, and I do so at this time.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if I could just speak on behalf of all of the people of central Texas and the Waco area, I want to express to the gentleman and to the family of the slain agent from your district that we will forever share in their sorrow and never forget their service to our community.

It has been said that no man can have greater love than to give his life for a friend, and in this case, we had ATF agents putting their lives on the line virtually for strangers, and I think that is the kind of caring, unselfish sacrifice that has made this such a great and a good country.

I do want to express our deep sorrow to the families in your district and the friends of the slain agent, and, please, let them know on our behalf that in central Texas they shall never be forgotten.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for his comment. I know the families of these brave ATF officers thank him as well.

To complete the record, I have the names of the gentlemen who were slain: Conway LeBleu, age 30, left a wife and two children; Todd McKeehan, age 28, left a wife; Robert Williams left a wife. All three were killed. Ken King was shot in the chest and survived. He was shot with a .50-caliber machinegun. It went through his body armor, his body, and out through his body armor. He was shot several other times in other places, and, God willing, he will live to talk about the event. Bill Beauford is another one who was shot and may lose his leg as a result of this tragedy.

All of these people are just brave, brave folks, and I do not have the names of the other agents who were involved in the conflict. But I do not mean to exclude anybody simply by failure to mention their names. But I would say that anything said here, at least from this Member, and I am sure from all of the others in this House is from our hearts. Our sentiments go out to your families, and we thank you for your service.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the members for their comments.



Yesterday in our committee hearing, our chairman very appropriately called for a moment of reflection at the start of the hearing, and I would just like to close by asking everyone, in whatever God they believe, to take a little time to thank these people.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution honoring the slain ATF officers in Waco. Mr. Speaker, this time they all did not go home. Special agents Steve Willis, Robert J. Williams, Conway LeBleu, and Todd McKeenhan gave the ultimate sacrifice. Fifteen of their partners were injured or wounded.

I saw, as we all did, the gunfire begin from within that compound. I saw what Secretary Bentsen called the incredible bravery of all the agents involved.

Mr. colleagues know that I would like to see that assault weapons and mail order machine-gun parts and .50 caliber weapons of war are not available to criminals or zealots.

Until we do that we are going to have to rely on the incredible bravery of agents like Willis, Williams, LeBleu, and McKeenhan. Men and women who as a daily business look for the places where dangerous persons have illegally stockpiled antipersonnel weapons and just go in and get them. Unless some factor goes wrong, some factor they maybe can't control. Then they do not go home.

Some people are shocked that law enforcement officers have died and are full of questions. Those of us who know what it is that ATF does are deeply saddened. Maybe we need to recognize that for all their work-a-day invulnerability, we are asking a bit much. Maybe we can give more to these fallen than our mourning and a place on a long wall at Judiciary Square. Maybe we can think about them a little harder, and pay attention to them a little more, and share in their knowledge that they are not invulnerable—only well-trained, experienced, committed and awesomely brave. Maybe we can alter the balance in favor of them, their counterparts and ourselves.

In Waco, TX, 4 special agents of the Bureau of Alcohol lie dead and 15 of their comrades wounded.

We cannot know exactly what happened, yet. But we do know that these agents were doing something that they and their brother and sister agents do every day. They were moving in on another group of individuals whose violent philosophy and awesome stockpile of weapons were a threat to others and themselves.

We must ask ourselves whether we reflect enough on the task these agents volunteer to perform for us. Another day, another armed gang rounded up. Do we think about them enough or talk about them enough? They tracked down over 13,000 violent career criminals, armed gangsters, bombers and arsonists last year and they bring them in and they convict them and they do not make a big deal of it.

Over 230 times last year ATF special response teams opened the way where armed offenders were holed up and it was likely that there would be shooting. They opened the way, did their job, and went home, all of them. What level of professionalism, training and personal commitment does that speak to?

Did we pay attention yesterday when ATF's Associate Director Dan Hartnett was asked why his agents would go into a location where zealots were known to have machine-guns and .50 caliber guns? His answer tells the story—he said that was precisely why they did go in.

I understand that we will have zealots; I do not understand why zealots have machine-guns and bombs and .50 caliber weapons. Thank God that if we do, we have men and women in ATF who will go in for all of us.

Did we watch those agents who got caught in a deadly fire because at some point a vital element of surprise was lost? Their discipline and their control were remarkable. They did not blast away indiscriminately, that is not what they are trained to do. They established a perimeter, held it and some went out unarmed to aid their fallen partners. Fallen heroes that we mourn and salute today.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frustrating things about government service is that when hard-working public servants go above and beyond the call of duty, seldom are they recognized for it. It is generally only when there are problems of one kind or another that they are noticed.

As chairman of the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee, I am familiar with the ever-increasing responsibilities and activities of the Bureau to enforce Federal laws regulating alcohol, tobacco, explosives, and firearms. Its agents face danger on a daily basis.

Fortunately, these highly trained agents rarely suffer injury or loss of life, but, as the events of recent days have demonstrated, tragedy is still an ever-present part of the job.

The resolution before the House recognizes the heroic sacrifice of Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Special Agents Steve Willis, Robert J. Williams, Conway LeBleu and Todd McKeenhan, who were killed, as well as the 15 other agents wounded in Waco, TX, including Claire E. Rayburn of Austin. These agents remind us of the thousands of brave souls in law enforcement who put their lives on the line every day for our safety and protection.

Regrettably, the ordeal in my home State continues. Let us all hope and pray that there will be a peaceful resolution very soon.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HINCHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

#### S. CON. RES. 12

Whereas Special Agents Steve Willis, Robert J. Williams, Conway LeBleu and Todd McKeenhan, of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, were killed by hostile gunfire in the performance of a heroic effort to disarm a hostile cult and to protect the lives of innocent persons, including children, living in its compound;

Whereas these men, along with 15 other special agents who were wounded during this confrontation, were members of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms elite Special Response Teams, whose members are highly-trained and experienced in the execution of high-risk operations;

Whereas such Special Response Teams have been deployed over 230 times in the past year with no injury to any agent, including during a highly-publicized siege involving a fugitive white supremacist and during the Los Angeles civil disturbances in 1992;

Whereas 182 special agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms have been killed in the line of duty since Prohibition; and

Whereas the men and women of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms mourn the loss of their brother officers, but maintain discipline and a commitment to the protection of our citizens at the risk of their own lives on a daily basis: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the sacrifice and dedication of the agents of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms is a cornerstone of our system of justice and cause for both sorrow and pride.*

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, the Senate concurrent resolution just concurred in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] today had reserved 60 minutes as the leadoff special order today. He has asked me to ask unanimous consent to act as a substitute in his place as a sponsor of legislation I wish to speak to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### USDA MEAT INSPECTOR CALLS INSPECTION PROCEDURES A HEALTH RISK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at a hearing of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection and Competitiveness on February 18, Mr. William Lehman, a U.S. Department of Agriculture import meat inspector working on the United States-Canada border, warned that free trade with Canada has weakened inspection of imported meat and is likely to result in more food poisoning deaths in the future, like those that recently occurred in the Northwest.

In particular, he testified that he had been given instructions by Agriculture Department officials to give Australian meat that was transhipped through Canada, the same abbreviated inspection that Canadian meat receives, as a result of our free-trade agreement with Canada. He also made the subcommittee aware of a recent Agriculture Department rule change which now allows foreign countries to import ground meat into the United States and testified that grinding meat makes it almost impossible to detect bruises, abscesses, fecal contamination, or other conditions that otherwise would permit an import inspector to reject a shipment of imported meat.

Over the past 2 years, the subcommittee has held numerous hearings looking at the impact of trade agreements on the health and safety of the American public. At hearings 2 years ago, Mr. Lehman testified that the Department of Agriculture had implemented a streamlined program for the inspection of meat imported from Canada. Under this program two troubling policies are allowed. First, Canadian, not USDA inspectors, are allowed to determine which samples of meat are inspected, and second, only 1 of the 10 truckloads of Canadian meat even had to stop at our border.

Following the hearing 2 years ago, I requested a GAO investigation and sent letters to then Secretary of Agriculture Madigan. Last summer, he ordered the practices Mr. Lehman criticized to be stopped. Now only USDA inspectors are allowed to pull samples of Canadian meat for inspection, and the Canadian meatpackers are no longer told in advance which truckload will be inspected.

When children recently died in the Northwest and many more became seriously ill from meat contamination, I instructed the subcommittee staff to again speak with Mr. Lehman, and I was very disturbed to learn that the same individuals in the Department of Agriculture, who in the past advocated the flawed streamlined program, were once again using free trade as an excuse not to carefully inspect meat that ends up on American tables.

This time, the issue was not Canadian meat. Instead, in his testimony before our subcommittee on February 18, Mr. Lehman said that, "In the last six weeks, seven truckloads—averaging 40,000 pounds each—of boneless frozen beef slaughtered in Australia have entered the United States through Canada." Now this meat was still in its original packaging, marked product of Australia.

According to a bulletin sent by the Customs Service to its inspectors in the field and based on information obtained from the Department of Agriculture:

Trade reports allege that extensive quantities, multiple boatloads of Australian beef

is destined for Canada, where with little processing, it will be shipped into the United States \* \* \*. Such trade would obviously circumvent the constraints of the U.S. Meat Import Act.

The Meat Import Act places a 4-cents-per-pound duty on Australian meat and subjects Australian meat to an annual quota. In addition, an opinion prepared for the subcommittee by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress says that the Meat Import Act would also require that Australian meat shipped through Canada be reinspected as Australian meat when it enters the United States.

Yet, Mr. Lehman testified that when he asked his Agriculture Department superiors how to treat this Australian meat, he was told, "to treat the meat as if it were Canadian and let it pass without inspection. That means that here was no product exam, no species test, nothing." Mr. Lehman then commented, "I don't even know if what was in those boxes was beef." The question is why is Australia sending its meat through Canada. Is it to avoid our duty on imported meat, to exceed its annual import quota to the United States, or to take advantage of the excessively lax meat inspection deal the United States has with Canada.

Perhaps the unfortunate illness and death from *E. coli* bacteria contained in the meat served by the Jack-in-the-Box in Washington State could have been avoided had proper meat inspections been made of all meat.

Mr. Mark Manis, Director of the Agriculture Department's Import Division of Food Safety and Inspection Service, also testified at the hearing. Mr. Manis admitted to me that he made the decision that this Australian meat should be treated as Canadian meat, and directed that Mr. Lehman be so instructed. But, when I asked if he still agreed with that decision, he said that he did not; instead, he said he now recognizes that he made a mistake in instructing Mr. Lehman to give Australian meat shipped through Canada the same type of inspection that Canadian meat receives.

While it is certainly appreciated that Mr. Manis now recognizes the mistake he made, the unfortunate fact is that at least seven such shipments of Australian meat are known to have come through Canada, totaling about 300,000 pounds of meat. None of this meat was inspected in the manner Mr. Manis now says it should have been.

Mr. Manis also revealed that Australian meat suppliers are not now believed to have been the source of the contamination of the Jack-in-the-Box hamburgers. But, he said the company which is suspected of supplying contaminated meat to Von's, Jack-in-the-Box's processor, is known to have obtained its meat from nine different sources, one of which is Canadian.

In and of itself, increasing the number of inspections on the Canadian bor-

der will not protect the American consumer from bad Canadian meat or bad Australian meat, as long as those countries are permitted to export meat to the United States that is in a partially ground form. Grinding meat allows a foreign meat packer to disguise bad meat in such a way that its condition cannot be detected by an inspector.

The reality is that at this moment in time, the only form of inspection that we can perform is an inspection that relies on the ability of an inspector to detect contamination or other conditions that would render the meat unacceptable, by visually looking at it, touching it, feeling it, and smelling it. We do not yet have the ability to perform a timely bacterial test that would tell the inspector instantly whether the meat has bacterial contamination.

As a result, we have no choice, for the time being, but to rely on the experience and expertise of our meat inspectors both on the border and in domestic meat packing facilities. Permitting the importation of ground meat makes it virtually impossible for our inspectors to determine whether the condition of imported meat is suitable for the American public to consume.

I, therefore, strongly urge that the recent rule change on the importation of ground meat be reexamined. Until we have the capability of determining whether such meat is contaminated bacterially, we must not restrict our inspectors' ability to identify problems with imported meat that might produce bacterial contamination, like that which recently killed and harmed so many people in the Northwest.

In conclusion, I want to compliment Agriculture Secretary Espy for the steps he is taking to reevaluate all aspects of the meat inspection program. He recently met with whistleblowers who have made proposals for reforms in the Department. He also announced that funds would be included in the President's budget proposal to fill 160 of the 550 inspector positions left unmanned by the previous administrations.

Free trade must never be given a higher priority than our Government's clear and foremost responsibility to protect the health and safety of the American public. In the case of meat inspection, we know the severe limitations of our inspection program. Rather than reducing the need for inspection, free trade may actually create reasons to increase our country's inspection efforts.

□ 1340

CHANGE THE CONGRESS: ELIMINATE THE SELECT COMMITTEES

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HINCHY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming



[Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I want to visit for just a few minutes; I want to talk about change.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about change in an institution that resists change, and I want to talk a little bit about a current opportunity we have to make some important changes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an era of congressional reform or an era in which congressional reform has great incentive, reform that can bring about efficiency, reform that can bring about procedural improvement, cost savings, and not affect the recognition or importance of the issues.

The public is measuring the results of congressional action. Through the thousands of voices in the last election, Congress heard, or should have heard, clearly that people want change in business as usual. They want: cut spending, be more accountable, and work for the people instead of preserving the status quo, the institutional feeling that has been associated with this Congress.

We need to do something about the dual jurisdiction of committees that causes great territorial disputes turf wrestling. We need to do something about the number of committees so that there is one for every member of the majority party. We need to do something about the limitation of opportunities to discuss issues on the floor that provide alternatives.

But when Congress has an opportunity to prove that the voices of change are heard, that we can change the status quo, there are many here, including the majority leadership in particular, that chooses instead to keep the select committees rather than cut the fat. They want to keep bodies that are redundant, exercise no particular legislative purpose in offering bills, and spend tons of bucks on travel.

The fact is this is not an argument or a discussion about the issues that these committees deal with. It is not a discussion about aging, not a discussion about hunger or drugs or children. Those issues clearly are vital and important to this body and will be carried on by standing committees.

The standing committees write the bills and initiate the measures that deal with aging, hunger, children, and drugs. The select committees are redundant.

Mr. Speaker, those who are new to Congress face a test. Many of us, or most of us, campaigned for the privilege of being here by running on a reform platform. All of us pledged to change Congress and we missed one chance to change it. We missed it in the first day we were here on the rules opportunity to limit the terms of committee chairmen. Those who promised change voted "no." I am surprised.

But we have another chance, and this is a very important chance. This is not

a minor vote. It is a critical test of political will. Bit by bit Congress will change, but not if we allowed ourselves to be bent.

I have not been here long either, but I am sure freshmen have already noticed that Congress does not change easily and does a lot to justify itself to demonstrate self-preservation even in the face of logic.

The selects are an issue where some have tried to defy the logic of reform. Truthfully, there is no other alternative.

Cut the selects, and we can prove we are able to move on to other issues of reform, such as campaign reform, budget reform, procedural reform, and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, it is a simple issue. Already this body has voted to cut one select. Rather than face embarrassment, the issue is put back in the lobbies to see if some minds can be changed. But I suggest very sincerely and very respectfully that the voters are not going to change their minds. They want Congress to change and they want their representatives to buckle up and come to the strapping post and do what they promised to do.

Hand in hand with cutting the selects is the appropriations that should go straight to the Treasury and not be dispersed among the remaining committees. Here is an opportunity to have a bona fide, honest-to-goodness cut of spending, and that, my friends, is key.

Earnest attempts to change Congress is what this country needs. If you cannot commit to change Congress on the issue of doing away with selects, then those were hollow platforms that we all campaigned on.

#### LINE-ITEM VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I was a businessman. I am a freshman Congressman. I came to Congress to reform the Congress.

During the 1992 campaign people were demanding change. President Bush was painted as the status quo, while candidates Clinton and Perot were the voices of change. And the voters wanted change. People were frustrated because they viewed the Government as an indifferent body, depleted of any concern for the average paying citizen.

President Clinton was elected on many promises to effect change. He said that, many, many times, time after time, that he was the agent of change. But the hunger for change seems to be diminishing. We can talk and talk until the last cow comes home about reform; but nothing will be done as long as we maintain the system that fosters the pork-barrel legislation.

To really begin to close the spending floodgate, we must empower the Presi-

dent with the line-item veto. All but seven States give their chief executive the power of the budgetary line-item veto. This is a power that any chief executive should have if spending is to be controlled. Costly and useless projects are often the rewards for the long-time members and loyal insiders, at the expense of the American taxpayer. A President should have the power to veto these projects from the budget to manage the cost of Government.

Often, the pork-barrel projects are amendments to worthy bills. The President has to veto a good bill in order to get rid of the bad amendment. This is ridiculous. This totally limits the executive power to control budget expenditure.

It is amusing, the talk blaming the President. The President does not spend tax dollars, this Congress does. The Congress is the only body that appropriates and spends our tax dollars, and this Congress right here is wholly responsible for the billions spent for irresponsible, pork-barrel project scams.

□ 1350

Now I ask my colleagues, how can a President be blamed for spending policies if he cannot control the spending?

I say to the American people: Let's take President Clinton at his word. During his campaign he supported the line-item veto, just as Presidents Reagan and Bush did. The difference now is the simple fact that a Democrat President has a Democrat Congress.

Mr. Speaker, will President Clinton act to influence the Democrats to vote to give him the line-item veto? Will he keep his campaign promises?

Congress is the only body that has the power to control spending. It is time for the American people to demand no less of our President. Let us work together to make sure he keeps the promise.

#### CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1993-97

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1993 through 1997 and spending for fiscal year 1993. Spending levels for fiscal years 1994 through 1997 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

This is the second report of the 103d Congress for fiscal year 1993. This report is based on the aggregate levels and committee alloca-

tions for fiscal years 1993 through 1997 as contained in House report 102-529, the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 287.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, entitlement authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, March 3, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am herewith transmitting the status report on the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1993 through 1997 and spending estimates for fiscal year 1993, under H. Con. Res. 287, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1993. Spending levels for fiscal years 1994 through 1997 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

The enclosed tables also compare enacted legislation to each committee's 602(a) allocation of discretionary new budget authority

and new entitlement authority. The 602(a) allocations to House Committees made pursuant to H. Con. Res. 287 were printed in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the resolution (H. Report 102-529).

Sincerely,

MARTIN OLAV SABO,  
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1993 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 287

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF MARCH 2, 1993

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—	
	1993	1993-97
Appropriate level:		
Budget authority .....	1,246,400	6,669,200
Outlays .....	1,238,700	6,472,700
Revenues .....	845,300	4,812,900
Current level:		
Budget authority .....	1,247,892	(1)
Outlays .....	1,241,794	(1)
Revenues .....	849,333	4,807,168
Current level over (+) / under (-) appropriate level:		
Budget authority .....	+1,492	(1)
Outlays .....	+3,094	(1)
Revenues .....	+4,033	-5,732

1 Not applicable because annual Appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

#### DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1993			1993-97		
	Budget authority	Outlays	New entitlement authority	Budget authority	Outlays	New entitlement authority
<b>HOUSE COMMITTEE</b>						
Agriculture:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	13,656	12,806	15,190
Current level .....	1	1	0	3	3	0
Difference .....	1	1	0	-13,653	-12,803	-15,190
Armed Services:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	26	-41	26	313	-330	311
Difference .....	26	-41	26	313	-330	311
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	-60	-60	0	-118	-118	0
Difference .....	-60	-60	0	-118	-118	0
District of Columbia:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education and Labor:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	1,472	0	0	21,564
Current level .....	-128	-148	1,347	-132	-177	21,384
Difference .....	-128	-148	-125	-132	-177	-180
Energy and Commerce:						
Appropriate level .....	35	35	0	187	187	0
Current level .....	-166	-166	-25	-601	-601	-51
Difference .....	-201	-201	-25	-788	-788	-51
Foreign Affairs:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government Operations:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	-8	37	-8	-20	-20	-20
Difference .....	-8	37	-8	-20	-20	-20
House Administration:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0



## DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—Continued

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1993			1993-97		
	Budget authority	Outlays	New entitlement authority	Budget authority	Outlays	New entitlement authority
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior and Insular Affairs:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	-38	-38	0	2	2	0
Difference .....	-38	-38	0	2	2	0
Judiciary:						
Appropriate level .....	251	251	251	251	139	251
Current level .....	210	210	260	244	244	300
Difference .....	-41	-41	9	-7	105	49
Merchant Marine and Fisheries:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	4	4	0	-366	-366	0
Difference .....	4	4	0	-366	-366	0
Post Office and Civil Service:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Works and Transportation:						
Appropriate level .....	2,000	22	0	10,595	22	0
Current level .....	2,050	28	0	2,050	-44	0
Difference .....	50	6	0	-8,546	-66	0
Science, Space, and Technology:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Small Business:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs Transportation:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	339	0	0	6,566
Current level .....	170	170	341	-76	-76	2,239
Difference .....	170	170	2	-76	-76	-4,327
Ways and Means Technology:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	352	352	1,213
Current level .....	3,590	3,590	3,475	5,719	5,719	5,564
Difference .....	3,590	3,590	3,475	5,367	5,367	4,351
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:						
Appropriate level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0

## DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1993

(In millions of dollars)

	Revised 602(b) subdivisions		Current level		Difference	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Rural Development .....	13,874	13,420	13,873	13,420	-1	0
Commerce, State, Judiciary .....	22,852	21,923	22,477	21,923	-375	0
Defense .....	255,560	266,963	253,618	264,699	-1,942	-2,264
District of Columbia .....	688	688	688	688	0	0
Energy and Water Development .....	22,080	21,409	22,080	21,409	0	0
Foreign operations .....	14,701	13,301	14,071	13,300	-630	-1
Interior .....	13,230	12,666	12,505	12,617	-725	-49
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education .....	62,161	62,428	62,144	62,380	-17	-48
Legislative .....	2,328	2,297	2,275	2,274	-53	-23
Military Construction .....	8,389	9,370	8,389	9,365	0	-5
Transportation .....	12,815	33,555	12,626	33,555	-189	0
Treasury-Postal Service .....	11,278	12,003	11,283	12,003	5	0
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies .....	66,172	65,307	66,042	65,303	-130	-4
Grand total .....	506,128	535,340	502,071	532,946	-4,057	-2,394

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, March 3, 1993.

Hon. MARTIN O. SABO,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S.  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this let-

ter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1993 in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1993 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H.Con.Res. 287). This report is tabulated as

of close of business March 2, 1993. A summary of this tabulation follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 287)	Current level +/- resol- ution
Budget authority .....	1,247,892	1,246,400	+1,492

(In millions of dollars)

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 287)	Current level +/- resolu- tion
Budget authority .....	1,247,892	1,246,400	+1,492
Outlays .....	1,241,794	1,238,700	+3,094
Revenues:			
1993 .....	849,333	845,300	+4,033
1993-97 .....	4,807,168	4,812,900	-5,732

Since my last report, dated February 3, 1993, there have been no changes that affect the current level of budget authority, outlays or revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,  
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 103D CONGRESS, 1ST  
SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR  
FISCAL YEAR 1993 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MARCH  
2, 1993

	Budget authority	Outlays	Reve- nues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues .....			849,333
Permanents and other spending leg- islation .....	764,101	737,205	
Appropriation legislation .....	732,061	743,943	
Offsetting receipts .....	(240,524)	(240,524)	
Total previously enacted .....	1,255,638	1,240,625	849,333
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted <sup>1</sup> .....	(7,746)	1,170	
Total current level <sup>2</sup> .....	1,247,892	1,241,794	849,333
Total budget resolution .....	1,246,400	1,238,700	845,300
Amount over budget resolu- tion .....	1,492	3,094	4,033

<sup>1</sup> Includes changes to the baseline estimate for appropriated mandates due to the following legislation: Technical Correction to the Food Stamp Act (Public Law 102-265); Higher Education Amendments (Public Law 102-325); Prevent Annual Food Stamp Price Adjustment (Public Law 102-351); Veterans' Compensation COLA Act (Public Law 102-510); Preventive Health Amendments (Public Law 102-531); Veterans' Benefits Act (Public Law 102-568); Veterans' Radiation Exposure Amendments (Public Law 102-578); and Veterans' Health Care Act (Public Law 102-585).

<sup>2</sup> In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$1,145 million in budget authority and \$6,988 million in outlays in emergency funding.

Notes: Amounts in parenthesis are negative. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

# DOMESTIC ANTITERRORIST REWARD ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, concerning the New York Trade Center bombing, a wire service story earlier today reported that a smell of decaying flesh was coming out of the remaining debris being removed from the site indicating that more bodies may still be buried there, and that is the reason I rise today, to call attention to the Nation's problem that is deadly serious that has once again reared its head on American soil. It is terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday's bombing blast in New York City has reminded us that this threat is not something confined to Third World countries or to countries at war. It has reminded us of our own vulnerability and the great debt we all owe to the various security forces throughout this country at the

Federal, the State, and local levels. It has reminded us that, yes, there are barbarians at the gate, barbarians whose cowardice, whose insidiousness, and disrespect for human life knows no bounds. Mr. Speaker, let this be a reminder of our need for vigilance.

That is why I point to this poster. Let this be a cold awakening to those who want to gut our defense budget, our intelligence budget, and our security structures in this country.

If there can be any silver lining in this tragedy, Mr. Speaker, which has claimed at least 5 innocent lives, wounded more than 1,000 people, and disrupted still thousands more lives, it would be if the Nation woke up and recognized this fact.

Despite the end of the cold war, the world remains an unstable and very dangerous place. In fact, there are reasons to believe that the terrorist threat is greater now than ever before and could even get worse in the future.

This is true for several reasons, Mr. Speaker. First, the collapse of the Soviet Union has shattered the links between that empire and the multitudinous terrorist groups that were aligned with it in opposition to the United States and the West. It has long been known, and has now been amply documented by the new, democratic Government of Russia, that the Soviet Union funded, trained, armed, and exercised great influence over an array of terrorist groups throughout the world.

While this was heinous, and contributed to many unspeakable acts and tragic revolutions, there were times when the Soviets, in the interests of good relations with the West, encouraged restraint on their clients.

They did not do it often, but they did it at times. Today, this restraint is gone, and the terrorist groups, though perhaps less well-funded, are operating independently. This makes their movements even harder to track.

Their hatred for the United States and the West continues unabated, and what is more, they are just as well armed as ever, perhaps even more so.

With the Chinese Government continuing to arm rogue elements around the world, and with Russian military personnel and defense workers trying to turn a quick buck, obtaining arms is no problem for these terrorist groups anywhere in the world, and, as the World Trade Center bombing tragically displayed, even crude, homemade devices can cause great damage.

Another development which may actually increase the threat of terrorism is European integration. We are talking about Europe 1992. While visa-free travel in Europe is no doubt a positive phenomenon on balance, it makes the life of the terrorist that much easier. Now, once in Europe, a terrorist can shift locations endlessly, skipping from one police jurisdiction to another, without ever going near a public official.

Mr. Speaker, a few years back, we took action to help our security agents track down suspected terrorists abroad who were suspected of terrorist acts against American citizens and their property overseas. I sponsored an amendment which eventually became law, which is cited by this poster, that created a bounty for terrorists who attacked U.S. citizens and U.S. interests abroad for up to \$2 million. That is the law today. Now that American soil has again been violated by the plague, it is time to make this bounty apply to acts of terrorism here at home, as well.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have just today introduced a bill along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs who I have had the privilege of serving with for many years, along with the gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. We have introduced this bill called the Domestic Antiterrorist Reward Act of 1993 which would raise the bounty for acts of domestic terrorism, currently standing at \$500,000, up to the same \$2 million, the same amount currently available for bounties leading to the arrest and conviction of terrorists who attack American citizens overseas, and I say to the Members of Congress, let's show the victims of this outrageous act that we will not rest until the perpetrators are caught. Let's give our security agents, so unfairly maligned in some circles, a little assistance.

Just knowing that one of their own might turn them in for a \$2 million bounty is in itself a deterrence against terrorism, a deterrence that could save the lives of American citizens right here in this country, as well as overseas.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my very good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend and colleague from the State of New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for organizing today's special order on terrorism. In addition, I would like to commend the Congressman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for introducing legislation to boost the maximum reward for information on domestic terrorist incidents from \$500,000 to \$2 million. I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of that measure.

As many of our colleagues will recall, a few years ago, Congressman SOLOMON led the effort in the House to increase the reward for information on international terrorist incidents from \$500,000 to \$2 million. Our current effort is to bring the domestic reward into parity with the international reward.

Mr. Speaker, virtually every American household saw the dramatic television footage of the World Trade Cen-



ter explosion on Friday of last week. Sadly, in my district, bordering New York City, the tragedy struck close to home and claimed the life of Robert Kirkpatrick, a carpenter and locksmith, whose neighbors described as generous to a fault. Robert, whose office was on the second level of the trade center's parking garage, was one of the five people killed in that incident. In addition, over 1,000 were injured as a result of the bomb blast.

Over the years, due to the extraordinary efforts of our Nation's law enforcement officials, Customs Service and intelligence agencies, the United States has been virtually free of terrorist incidents. However, as the World Trade Center bombing tragically demonstrates, we are certainly not free of this criminal scourge.

Several years ago, I introduced legislation calling on President Reagan to convene a summit meeting of world leaders to adopt a program against international terrorism. Today, with the collapse of the Soviet Union and our growing level of cooperation with the republics, there exists an opportunity to further curtail terrorist activity. For this reason, I will be introducing next week a comprehensive antiterrorism bill, and I invite the support of my colleagues.

Terrorism ranks as a primary concern for Americans, and demands the attention of our Government, which has a clear responsibility to provide for the safety of its citizens. However, we are all frustrated that our Government, a world superpower, with vast intelligence and military powers cannot always stop terrorists. Additionally, we must beware of treating terrorists as anything other than what they are: Criminals; for if we do, we are playing their game, which is to gain publicity.

It is vital that the United States continue to adhere to the principles of the Nixon terrorism committee which stated that terrorists should be prosecuted for criminally defined acts of terrorism. While there is a significant expense involved in extraditing and trying a terrorist, the result, a public trial which removes any grandeur from the terrorist, is likely to assist in curtailing the spread of terrorism.

Following the gulf war, the world was granted a reprieve from terrorism. However, terrorism has not ceased, it has temporarily gone into remission. Many of the states that previously supported terrorism have only shelved their terrorist infrastructures for temporary storage.

I believe that there are several steps which can be taken to strengthen our Nation's approach to terrorism. While democracies must preserve the ideals upon which they are founded, I believe that democracies can and should also have a strong response to terrorism. Our Nation, working with

other nations, can severely curtail the freedoms under which terrorists have operated during the past decade.

My legislation seeks to strengthen the U.N. position against terrorism, to utilize our vast economic resources and political pressure against states which support terrorism to strengthen bilateral and multilateral cooperation against terrorist organizations, focus on encouraging media restraint in reporting terrorist incidents, and to strive to alleviate the social and economic problems which contribute to the rise of terrorist activity.

The United States has had an official policy on terrorism since 1972, when President Nixon created the counterterrorism office following the massacre of the Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics. However, over the past 20 years, it has become increasingly apparent that terrorism is a growth industry. Following the dramatic Iranian hostage ordeal of 1979, the Congress and the Executive branch cooperated to expand antiterrorist measures.

While not approaching the levels of terrorist incident in the mid-1980's, according to the U.S. State Department Patterns of Global Terrorism Report, international terrorist incidents increased by 22 percent in 1991. However, while the report clarifies that much of the 1991 increase was due to the gulf war, it is also apparent that terrorism remains a problem.

While no antiterrorism policy is 100 percent effective, there are several disturbing trends in terrorism that must be addressed. The first trend is the prevalence of state-sponsored terrorism. With the success of terrorism as a foreign policy tool demonstrated repeatedly over the past two decades, terrorism has attracted its devotees.

Second, the revelations of the post-Persian Gulf war regarding the extent of the Iraqi nuclear program, coupled with the open pursuit of nuclear weapons by Iran and North Korea, the specter of nuclear terrorism suddenly becomes very real.

The United States cannot ignore the possibility of nuclear terrorism or the real threat of continued state sponsorship of terrorist organizations. There are several important opportunities available to the United States that were not available 2 years ago. Most importantly, the collapse of the Soviet Union and the Western World's current level of cooperation with the Commonwealth of Independent States presents an opportunity to form a coalition of the major economic states of the world to work toward the eradication of state sponsored terrorism. Second, the success of the coalition's actions to avert terrorist incidents during the Persian Gulf conflict indicates an opportunity to further curtail international terrorism by focusing additional resources and international political will on the terrorism problem.

The current high-intensity controls over nuclear materials will likely ensure for the short term that nuclear materials will not fall into the hands of terrorist organizations. However, with the increasing use of nuclear power worldwide, as well as the instability of the former Soviet Union's vast arsenal of nuclear weapons, the world community cannot solely rely upon the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Non-Proliferation Treaty to prevent a determined terrorist organization from obtaining nuclear material.

Because of the time, material, and expertise needed to construct even a crude nuclear device, the international community should cooperate to develop a shared intelligence and military response to realistic nuclear terrorist threats. While this issue is one that all nations will not agree upon, the United States should begin working within the United Nations to expand the convention against terrorism to include nuclear terrorism.

With adequate intelligence, the United States can monitor, and to a certain extent, predict the actions of certain international terrorist organizations. Leading up to the tragic bombing of Pan Am flight 103 in December 1988, there were several warning clues that should have alerted authorities to the potential for a disastrous incident. Since that tragedy, airline security has improved, as has international cooperation on intelligence activities. However, there is still room for improvement.

State-sponsored terrorism represents a higher intensity level of terrorism which could potentially become a serious national security threat to the United States because state sponsorship of terrorism greatly expands resources for terrorists, the level of violence and the organizational effectiveness of state-sponsored terrorist organizations represents a direct threat to our democratic institutions. A state-sponsored terrorist organization has several significant advantages, including: access to intelligence; financial support; sophisticated munitions, most notoriously plastic explosives and difficult to detect munitions; and lastly, technical expertise.

State-sponsored terrorism dropped significantly during 1991, mainly because of factors related to the Persian Gulf war, but also due to the drastically changed global balance of power. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the cessation of its support for states sponsoring terrorist organizations worldwide, dealt a blow to organized terrorism, both in terms of financial support to terrorist supporting regimes such as North Korea and Cuba, as well as to terrorist organizations such as the Palestinian Liberation Organization [PLO].

Unlike the world situation a few years ago, today's global balance pre-

sents several opportunities to address state sponsored terrorism. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States and the Western nations have an opportunity to increase the pressure on states which support terrorism, including those states that frequently pay ransoms to terrorist supporting states. With a concerted effort to pressure the six terrorist supporting states economically and politically to abandon their terrorist organizations, the United States and its allies can effectively dismantle the elaborate support apparatus that has grown over the past decade.

A national strategy against terrorism must be a coherent, coordinated, multilevel approach to all the different aspects of terrorism. The current world political situation is such that a focused effort to end state-supported terrorism would have a reasonable chance of success.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the end of the cold war struggle, the United States and the G-7 are situated to place enormous economic pressure on states which support terrorism. The current sanctions against Libya are an excellent example of a process that is sufficiently flexible.

The United States should also work with its allies to request media restraint in reporting terrorist incidents. The Chicago Sun Times and the Daily News are to be commended for their policies which include paraphrasing terrorist demands to avoid propaganda, banning the participation of reporters in negotiations, coordinating coverage through supervising editors in contact with police.

The United States also take the lead in increasing intelligence cooperation on terrorist activity, by focusing mainly on improving intelligence sharing among nations. The focus should also include improving intelligence and counterterrorism activities with business. While the number of attacks against businesses abroad has declined, American businesses remain an easy target for terrorism because of the necessary openness they must maintain in order to conduct business. On the other hand, U.S. Government facilities, following several tragic bombings during the 1980's have significantly improved their security by hardening the installations and increasing security. Because businesses with overseas interests have taken steps to improve their own counterterrorism activities, the Department of State as the lead agency for the protection of Americans abroad should take on the responsibility to coordinate with businesses overseas to coordinate counterterrorism activities. Additionally, because businesses will almost always pay ransom for abducted personnel, the terrorists have come to view business kidnappings as a prime source of funding. It would be worth-

while for the businesses to coordinate action with the U.S. Government in order to curtail future kidnapping through education and advance warnings.

Additionally, the causes of terrorism must not be overlooked. Terrorism is brought about in many cases because of serious human rights problems or economic difficulties. While efforts to promote democracy will not be a panacea to the causes of terrorism, it will strengthen international will to resist terrorism. Additionally, the current focus on peace talks in the Middle East represents an important step in bringing the parties to the conflict together to eliminate the rhetoric and hatred which has been the cause of nearly 50 percent of the terrorist incidents of the past two decades.

The Nixon committee also stated that the U.S. Government would seek the reduction or elimination of the causes of terrorism at home and abroad. In situations in which the underlying problems leading to terrorism represent legitimate concerns, the United States should work, along with the United Nations, to reduce or eliminate these threats.

U.S. policy toward terrorism has been focused and refined since its first inception in 1972, and currently represents a fairly coherent and effective strategy. However, because of the dramatic changes in the world balance of power over the past 5 years as well as the growing threat from state-sponsored and nuclear terrorism, the focus on counterterrorist activities must be strengthened and expanded.

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, I again commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for bringing up this measure today, to increase the rewards for information concerning domestic violence that is brought about by terrorists against our own people here in the United States. I urge our colleagues to join in this effort to bring about the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for being a sponsor of this major piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I might also say I was just handed a notice that informs me that the White House is confirming that an arrest has been made concerning the Trade Center bombing. It is a person of foreign origin.

Mr. Speaker, let me just point out what the existing law does. I would take an opportunity just to read this poster. This poster appears all over the world in various countries where terrorist acts have been taken against American citizens.

This poster says:

\$2 million reward. The United States Government is authorized to make payment of

up to \$2 million for information aiding in the prevention of terrorist acts outside the United States against U.S. citizens or property, or for information leading to the arrest or conviction of any person who has committed a terrorist act against United States citizens or property. Any person with information is urged to contact the nearest United States embassy or consulate, or, if unable to do so, to write \* \* \*.

And it gives an address here in this country.

Here is another poster that appears in every country throughout the world. It says, "There's a price we pay for terrorism, and there's a price we will pay to stop it."

It goes on and says:

Three American hostages have not come back from Lebanon. Their agonizing captivity ended not in freedom, but in cold blooded execution at the hands of their captors. To bring these murderers to justice, the United States Government offers rewards of up to \$2 million. The money is available under a program to obtain information that helps punish past terrorist acts or to prevent future ones. If you have any information \* \* \*.

And it goes on to explain what one should do.

Mr. Speaker, this poster carries the picture of Col. William Higgins, the marine colonel murdered in 1991, Peter Kilburn, murdered in 1986, and William Buckley, whom we all remember, murdered in 1985.

Mr. Speaker, the point of our legislation today is to make this program, which is now available for acts of terrorism overseas, available for domestic acts of terrorism within the territory of the United States, such as the U.S. Trade Center building in New York that was just recently bombed. We hope to get this legislation enacted immediately. It will go a long way toward deterring acts of terrorism against American citizens in this country.

#### CONDITIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the nations of the former Soviet Union have reached a critical moment in their respective histories. The euphoria, at least reflected in the Western press, the American press particularly, of the previous Soviet Union's 1991 so-called revolution has faded, and a harsh reality has taken hold. The crumbling Russian economy is hurting people and has nearly halted any progress toward stabilizing a more democratic government, even though there have been very substantial changes since 1989 involving the re-drafting of the Constitution and the setting up of a full parliamentary or a congressional system very much patterned on ours, and on our committee system, incidentally.



□ 1410

It has been very little reported in our press. The environment of the former Soviet Union is becoming so unstable that those heroes of 1991, at least as reflected in our press, must fight for their political lives today. President Boris Yeltsin's popular rating has plummeted from 90 percent to about 30 percent in just about a year, compelling him to retract many of the reforms he was proposing that had so excited some of our intelligentsia in the West.

As the astute French observer of the last century, Alexis de Toqueville observed, the fates of the United States and Russia are intimately intertwined. They were the two superpowers, growing up together, while the rest of the world stagnated.

In his words, "Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same."

He writes, "Yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half of the globe."

All through my public career, and even before, I have been a very concentrated and sustained student of the history of that part of the world with specific delineation of the parallel developments of the United States, and what we have commonly called, Russia. It is very similar, even in its developmental stages, from the joinder of these diffuse States and cultures.

One other aspect that never has really been conveyed to us, and through the years, after I did enter public office, and on the city council had occasion to meet some officials that had been given permission to travel in the United States, and I found that in the respective States, such as Armenia or Azerbaijan, that the citizens there had a choice of language.

The official language, for instance, in the State of Armenia, was Armenian, not Russian. The choice given a student, as one proud parent was telling me, whereby his son chose to go to an English language school. He could have gone to an Armenian language education school, or he could have gone to a French language school. He chose English and became an engineer. And that was impressive to me because, coming from an area in which we have up to now, thank goodness, and I have done everything in my power to make sure that it is a blending and not a confrontation or a conflict of cultures.

I saw the respect that I felt was missing in our part of the country, where back in the 1920's and before the war in the 1930's, in a well-intended effort to Americanize, steamroller tactics were used that I thought were very destructive, and which took the war and then subsequent developments, to reveal and bring out at certain points in the late 1960's and early 1970's, in a sort of dangerous way.

Fortunately, I think the record will show that I was able to contribute my

might to creating a situation where we would have the blessing of extracting from the two very substantial cultures, the best from each, rather than confrontational areas, such as, unhappily, we see in our neighboring country to the north in Canada with the French-speaking Quebec Province and the continuing effort to separate and become an autonomous French-speaking state. Also in some parts of our country, in Florida, for instance, where you see a conflict, not a confluence, which was the theme that we chose when I initiated the legislation that led to the first world's fair, south of St. Louis, in my city of San Antonio, in 1968, known as Hemisphere.

And our theme was the confluence of civilizations.

In other words, what we have now in Russia is not connected, for instance, at least from reading our press, with the very dangerous potential conflagration that can spread to a real world situation in East Europe, or the middle East Europe, and the fact that we just do not have access to the information and knowledge we ought to have. And that has been true for many years, since the end of the hot shooting phase of World War II and the advent of the so-called cold war, which has resulted in what I call the cold war culture from which we are still suffering the affliction thereof and is hobbling, even in our assessment of what is happening, not only throughout the world but even now in our own country.

And the fact that we have had events, for instance, in 1990, in November, after the reform movements in Russia had gone very far and the movement toward autonomy had initiated, I saw nowhere in the American press, the report of the treaty that was entered into between the Soviet Union at the time still or the Russian leader, Gorbachev, and the German leader, the Minister Kohl. And that agreement provided for a grant of credit for a money investment from the German Republic at that time of about 87 billion deutsche marks or somewhere right underneath or below \$50 billion.

Now, that was a substantial amount, but it was a treaty. And there were certain understandings. And one of them was that this aid was to help Russia in order that it could stabilize its transition from its withdrawal, not only from East Germany but from the areas now in contention in Europe. And also the stipulated agreement, that in turn, Germany would agree to not have more than a 300,000-man army, so that I notice a report that came out just a week or so ago, from Germany, in which Mr. Kohl was advancing the reduction and to about that amount or number of 300,000.

□ 1420

In the meanwhile, we do not read about the terrible, in fact, unbeliev-

able, barbaric conflict that has turned loose in Middle Europe or Eastern Europe, and the potential for a real conflagration, and in a way, a spillover from our venture into the Persian Gulf so-called war.

It involves Turkey, because if the events continue, and they do not seem to have been deterred one bit, as they are, Turkey will not stand by. In fact, and again, I did not see it reported in the American press, but it entered into treaties with Bulgaria and Albania. Bulgaria and Turkey have had a history, and in fact, even in the area of the Yugoslavian, the previous Yugoslavian country or republic, Turkey at one time was the dominant force.

It was Russia that fought the Turks, lost many a soldier in the last century defending the so-called Slavs. There is an identification between that country. In fact, there is more fear now of Germany, than there has been of Russia, in countries including Poland and into the Slavic territories.

The reason goes back to the fact that we, of course, do not, and have not, too publicly admitted that had it not been for the defense of the Slavs that Hitler had ordered either be exterminated or those that could successfully be enslaved, be enslaved, and incidentally, let me say by way of parentheses that two of the most stalwart German generals who had that order from Hitler would not carry it out. They had more compassion than what we can say we showed in the Persian Gulf war, and for which we still must face the consequences.

We cannot go out and kill off over 200,000 human beings, whether they are Moslem Arabs or not, men, women, and children, 15-, 16-, 17-year-old conscripts who were fleeing, and while fleeing we massacred them; we cannot do that without some ultimate reaction, and what has happened is simply the revolt of Islam, not just in the Middle East but worldwide, from Pakistan through the areas of contention now, where Serbia, going into this territory known as Bosnia, where you have had all these groups, the Islamic, Muslim, as well as the Christian and others living in peace for generations, and suddenly we have this terrible, terrible, barbaric, one of the most barbaric incidents happening in the entire history of the 20th century, which surely has been the most bloody and the most retrogressive into barbarism in the history of mankind.

So we are emerging into the 21st century with this terrible handicap on us. Yet we must also realize that there have been only two nations of any major size that in the last 200, 300 years have not gone to war against each other. Those two are Russia and the United States.

De Toqueville's observation in the last century was very apt. Our acquisition, for example, of Alaska would never have been possible if there had

not been, even in the days of the Tsars, the basic affinity or respect for the United States that seems to have permeated through history.

Now, though, we are going to see, in my opinion, we are seeing the prophesy of this very substantial Russian leader, Arbitov, who in 1988, in late 1988, was the man who was the leading minister or expert on the United States.

He told a group of Americans, academicians as well as officials, he said, "Let me tell you what is about to happen." They asked him, "What is this happening here? We are on the threshold of something that we sense is happening in the Soviet Union: glasnost, perestroika." He said, "Let me tell you what we are going to do. We are going to do you the biggest harm anybody could do. We are going to get rid of your worst enemy, and that is so-called international communism, or the so-called evil empire."

He said it so smilingly that, sure enough, that is what has happened. We still do not know how to react. We got so used, over these decades, to seeing Communists everywhere and forgetting history and going into ventures that, had we had the correct perspective of that part of the world, we would not have lost 55,000 Americans in Vietnam and we would not have lost near that amount or about the same amount in Korea, because all along we have visualized a monolithic, monolithic Communist power and forgotten history.

We were always persuaded soon after, after 1945, that the biggest menace would be Russia coming through Central Europe and through middle Germany. For what? It always seemed to me to be so fantastic and out of reality, and yet it caused, when I would speak out, people to look at me as if maybe perhaps I was suspect.

Nevertheless, that is where we are today. We are still not assessing. The reason I rise today is to point out how this, again, misperception has led to a costly venture for the taxpayers, in this case with the intention of helping the Soviet Union, or what is left of it, regain some stability.

The United States Government can indeed, certainly if the German Government has, help determine whether Russia and the other republics make positive change. In order to do that we have to do it intelligently, which we have not to date.

Our Government has employed numerous aid programs in its efforts to assist the nations or the republics of the former Soviet Union. The Bush administration took the wrong route, channeling foreign aid through the back door without careful consideration of the aid's purpose, and this in full view of what we had been talking about in the case of the same approach toward Iraq, and the fateful consequences to the taxpayer, and to the well-being and eventual policy of the United States.

Today I will show that that administration's political scheming allowed Russia to be granted aid for which it did not qualify, and that as a result the previous administration has placed the United States taxpayer squarely in harm's way.

The main programs that the Bush administration utilized to quietly aid the former Soviet Union were the Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation, the same old boy involved in the BNL Bank out of Atlanta and Iraq, and a similar credit guarantee program at the Export-Import Bank. These programs were created to help creditworthy nations purchase products from American companies.

□ 1430

Because Russia was not creditworthy, the Bush administration had to politicize the process and bypass the controls designed to protect American interests, keep the aid flowing. Providing such assistance without careful consideration of its benefits and risk is of little use to anyone, including the former Soviet Union. The former Soviet States have not made payments on some of the United States guaranteed loans for more than 3 months now. Delinquencies at this point total over \$400 million.

One bank, and remember what I have said all through, at the bottom of all of this is financing and banks, one bank has already made claim on a guarantee. When it is all said and done, the previous administration's disregard for the risks involved in credit guarantees may cost American taxpayers more than \$4.5 billion, as we struggle with our own budget deficit. And that is all we hear today, day and night. This is an expense we can ill-afford.

A straightforward policy to aid Russia would have been more effective and beneficial to both sides, but to do that you would have to come out here, you would have to debate it, you would have to figure out if indeed an intelligent and a real, meaningful, action program was being carried out, and not one that would end up in not only defeating the purpose for which it was instituted, but disappointing the recipient as well as ourselves.

The current administration should learn from the mistakes of the past. I only hope they do.

Up to now I have written a letter to Secretary Espy after I reported the bank, a French bank, but also other American banks standing by, suing on the basis of some guarantees on interest, and some of this Agricultural Commodity Credit guaranteed loan. In the future we must of necessity and hopefully will debate our options for assisting Russia and other nations of the former Soviet Union. The Bush administration did not see fit to do so. Obviously it was confronted with the major

problem. I am trying to understand. It was an election year. The pressure was great, the European countries, from throughout the world about what is the United States going to do to help. But the vast majority of United States assistance to the former Soviet Union has flowed from the Department of Agriculture.

USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to develop and administer programs to expand U.S. agricultural export markets. During the early 1980's, the CCC devised the Credit Guarantees Program to accomplish this mission. The general sales manager of the 102 program, which is the technical name they give this, and it is often referred to as a GSM 102, and that is the way I will refer to it. The program targets countries that have potential for additional food purchases but require credit to make the purchases because they are short on cash. Instead of providing credit directly, the CCC guarantee operates to attract credit from the private sector to finance sales of U.S. agricultural commodities. The institution that provides the credit must be located within the United States. But last year we had one guarantee program, and incidentally, it was not sent to our Banking Committee, that changed that, and it is the first time in that guarantee program any sovereign nation has gotten into. But that is another matter.

The CCC will normally guarantee 98 percent of the principal plus a portion of the interest on the loan. All loans must be on terms of 3 years or less than 3 years. Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, USDA, through its Commodities Division and Attache Service of the Foreign Agricultural Service enters into discussions with foreign countries interested in the GSM program. CCC then allocates the amounts of credit guarantees among selected countries, establishing specific country lines by commodity.

These proposed allocations are then presented for advice to an inner-agency group, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Affairs. And if any of you have been following the remarks I have been making for 3 years with respect to this NAC, so-called, or Inter-Agency Council, then you will know why I am just generally referring to it now.

Food assistance to the former Soviet Union has been provided almost entirely through the GSM 102 program. I have provided this explanation of how the program is supposed to operate in order to describe the way in which the Bush administration manipulated and misused the program in the case of the former Soviet Union, almost identically as it did in the case of Iraq. The first example of the Bush administration's misuse of the program involves the National Advisory Council, or the NAC that I referred to. The NAC is



composed of representatives from the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve, the State Department, the Agency for International Development, the Commerce Department, the Export-Import Bank and the U.S. Trade Representative. The Department of Agriculture is not an official member of the NAC. USDA does participate when the NAC is making a decision on one of its programs.

Each agency brings its own expertise to the process. The NAC thoroughly reviews program proposals, openly debates the merits and the shortcomings of each one, let me say openly until I went into the matter, and then lo and behold they closed the doors, and we had a protest. But as far as I know, they never re-opened them again in the case of our efforts to get the information with respect to the Iraqi guarantees.

This group then votes its approval or disapproval. While the NAC's decision is technically not binding, USDA has never implemented a program that was voted down by the NAC. As we learned in the case of loan guarantees to Iraq, the Bush White House often did not want to hear what the NAC had to say. One reason was that many NAC members take seriously our Government's obligation to protect the taxpayers and even national security. I brought that out time and time again where the Federal Reserve representative at NAC was saying no, we advise against this. We had even the Export-Import expert on the creditworthiness of a nation saying no, this nation is not creditworthy. Iraq had defaulted with about five or six European countries, and yet we have the national defense, security, or Intelligence representative saying hey, this has dangerous implications for military use.

Despite all of that, NAC was pushed aside and those loans were processed anyway. So that we know that the Bush administration had gotten used to subverting the process by going around NAC. And since these members did not hesitate to speak out their views, that was a responsibility, and they felt uncomfortable.

There is another downside of the NAC process, and that is that members' views are recorded in great detail. The Bush White House was never anxious to make opposing views open, and the administration fought hard to prevent the Congress from obtaining the NAC documents which regarded the views of agencies which opposed Mr. Bush's policies of supporting Saddam Hussein with generous credit that Iraq was highly unlikely to repay. We reported that previously.

The case of Iraq offers an excellent example of why the White House has an interest in subverting the NAC process when the time came to make decisions on the Soviet Union. Throughout the 1980's several NAC agencies consist-

ently opposed the huge levels of agricultural aid the Bush and Reagan administrations were sending to Iraq.

□ 1440

Without their diligence, our foreign aid bill to Saddam Hussein would have been much higher than the \$2 billion plus that we are currently now paying for. Those agencies knew that Iraq was not creditworthy, and they correctly believed that the American taxpayer would eventually be stuck paying, repaying, the loans, and that is why they went around them.

Before 1989, the opposition of some NAC members did not prove to be an insurmountable obstacle to the aid program for Saddam. We brought that out time and time again. We had the intervention of the Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of State, Eagleburger, even the National Security Council.

So when USDA proposed a \$1 billion GSM program for Iraq for 1990, several NAC members then protested. We put all of that in the RECORD.

Then though the President signed the National Security Directive No. 26 which mandated that the policy was to help Iraq and, of course, that reduced the barriers; the Bush White House did not want to deal with the bureaucratic problems that were involved when it came to the GSM program for the U.S.S.R. They did not want open, honest debate. They did not want an accounting of the potential costs to the taxpayer of guaranteeing loans to a country that obviously could not repay. The White House also did not want to hear arguments that the program would do little good for the former Soviet Union.

The fact is that those nations are capable of producing more than enough food to feed their people. Most shortages in the former Soviet Union exist because of a breakdown in the distribution process. For example, Russia loses up to half of its milk production because they do not have simple milk chillers that we take for granted in America. They are not available. Fixing this problem should be simple. Yet the U.S. Government has done almost nothing to deal with it.

Many experts have argued that providing credit guarantees for food imports to those nations merely postpones well-known and badly needed reforms and prolongs the transition to self-sufficiency.

In any case, the Bush White House knew what it wanted and would not stand for interference with its wrong-headed plan. The solution was to simply run over the NAC. In an unprecedented move in December 1990, the White House completely avoided NAC's scrutiny and announced a \$1 billion GSM program for the U.S.S.R.

Now, that does not involve the congressional process. The White House

then chose to add insult to the NAC on top of the injury inflicted on the taxpayer. The \$1 billion proposal was submitted for NAC consideration after the decision had already been made. Imagine how the NAC members felt sitting around their meeting table and discussing a proposal that was already a done deal.

If a NAC member believed that this program would be too costly for the taxpayer, a view that would have been very correct, what could that member do? Absolutely nothing. But that was what the White House wanted. No discussion; no dissent; no consideration for the taxpayers, it turned out. Asking the NAC for advice on a done deal was a transparent trick to make the decision appear to be prudent, the result of careful consideration.

But the decision was not prudent. Thus we are now paying for Mr. Bush's mistake in Iraq and will soon begin to pay for the same mistake in the former U.S.S.R.

While the offer of \$1 billion may have seemed like a large allocation at the time, it was only a small beginning compared to what was on the horizon. Six months after the first announcement, the White House was up to its tricks again. This time the stakes were even higher.

In June 1991, the White House announced that the U.S.S.R. would receive another \$1.5 billion in credit guarantees. The same backdoor scheme was used. The White House once again presented the NAC with no choice but to just rubberstamp it. By the middle of 1991 the U.S.S.R. creditworthiness had deteriorated so far that the Bush administration could not find banks to risk even the nearly 2 percent of the loan not covered by the guarantee. In other words, while the administration tripped over itself to put taxpayers out on a limb for 98 percent of each loan, banks knew that the loans were losers. It was too dangerous for them to climb onto that limb for only 2 percent of the risk. This should have been a clear signal that GSM was the wrong program and that the risk to the taxpayer had become totally unacceptable.

But the Bush administration never was very good at reading signals. What was their solution? They decided that the best course was to put the taxpayer at risk for the entire bill, 100 percent of the loan. But the banks still would not take the risk even with 100 percent of the principal and 4½ percent of the interest guaranteed by the taxpayer. The few percentage points of unguaranteed interest was just too much to chance for those banks. You can guess the Bush administration's solution: Heap more risk on the taxpayer. They simply guaranteed higher interest rates.

Thus, since September 1991 the taxpayer has been responsible for the entire principal and almost all of the interest associated with every sale in the program of the former Soviet Union.

The Bush administration continued this pattern for 2 years, issuing nearly half of all GSM guarantees to Russia and other former Soviet Republics. This was done despite the fact that Russia has the lowest credit rating of any GSM participant.

By November of last year the former Soviet Union had received over \$5 billion in guarantees, and the administration was offering even more.

On November 30, however, the inevitable occurred. The USDA received its first notice that Russia was delinquent. There has not been 1 penny in payment since. Delinquencies now total more than \$400 million, and there is no sign that repayment will resume any time soon.

Over the next few years, the nations of the former Soviet Union will owe over \$4.5 billion. If these nations are unable to make the payments, the U.S. taxpayer will have to step in.

The burden that this program places on our Federal deficit is just one more mess that President Clinton will have to clean up, and I do not know what will be the recommendation other than generally the decision has been made to continue to help Russia somewhat. Now, whether it is going to be this way, I have not had a reply from my letter to the newly appointed Secretary of Agriculture, and, of course, he has just taken over, so we are patient.

I would like to note parenthetically that the fate of the GSM Program for the former Soviet Union may be symptomatic of broader problems with the GSM Program. A recent General Accounting Office study estimated that the cumulative cost of the program will be at least \$6.5 billion, or 48 percent of USDA's exposure in the total of outstanding guarantees and accounts receivable. These costs are especially disturbing in light of the fact that the study was unable to find any empirical evidence that the program has even met its basic goal of increasing U.S. exports worldwide. That is, indeed, sad.

In 1990, after learning how the administration had abused the GSM Program for the benefit of Saddam Hussein, the Congress enacted, and Mr. Bush signed, new legislation which we propelled to reform the GSM Program and prevent similar disasters from occurring again. The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 explicitly prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from making credit guarantees available to any country that the Secretary determines cannot adequately service the debt associated with such a sale.

This provision was written to prevent precisely the situation we are now facing. This law also prohibits the use of credit guarantees for foreign aid, which is what we were constantly yelling about in the case of Iraq, or foreign policy purposes which was a disqualification given itself by the Bush

administration and the Reagan administration. Nor can anyone doubt that the administration violated both of these provisions. Hardly so, even though the Congress passed the law and the President signed it.

It was obvious that it was being violated. Clearly the White House chose to overlook the law when it guaranteed \$5 billion in loans to the former Soviet Union.

A 48-percent loss record hardly demonstrates prudence of even basic competence.

The former Soviet Union also participates in several programs operated by the Export-Import Bank. Now, we have jurisdiction of the Export-Import Bank in the Banking Committee.

Also, there are important differences; these programs are similar to the GSM Program in that they guarantee repayment of loans used to purchase U.S. exports.

#### □ 1450

The Eximbank is also authorized to issue direct loans for this purpose. Taxpayer's exposure due to Eximbank programs is small when compared to the GSM Program, but Exim is considering much larger transactions even now. Exim has also seen fit to continue lending to the Russian Government while that same Government refuses to meet its obligations to USDA.

Currently, all of Exim's exposure is in the form of sovereign risk, government. Sovereign risk means that repayment of the loan is the responsibility of the Russian Government, as opposed to a private Russian entity. Until last week, exposure in this category totaled only about \$125 million. However, despite the fact that the Russian Government has not paid USDA in over 3 months, Exim authorized an unsecured direct loan to Russia last week for over \$85 million, thus increasing the exposure level to over \$210 million. I am sending a letter to the Acting Chairman of the Export-Import Bank on this matter today. I would like to know how the Bank can justify the issuance of more loans to a nation which is refusing to meet its obligations to a sister agency. This loan is questionable for another reason. By law, Eximbank cannot issue loans unless its Board of Directors determines that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment. That is the letter of the law. How can anyone believe that there is a reasonable assurance that Russia will repay the debt when it is so clearly demonstrating its inability to do so with CCC?

The Bank is considering other types of lending arrangements for Russia that would not involve sovereign risk. The most important of these is the Oil and Gas Framework Agreement, the terms of which are still being negotiated. If an accord is struck, Exim could provide \$2 billion in loans and

guarantees for Russia's oil and gas industry to purchase United States equipment and services. Repayments of these loans would be made by neither the Russian Government nor by Russia's oil and gas industry. Instead, the framework would require that the customers of Russia's oil and gas industry deposit payments directly into an off-shore escrow account to which Eximbank would have first access.

We are trying to carefully monitor the progress of these negotiations and will do the best we know how. But I think that it is very tenuous.

The international lending decisions of every Government institution are profoundly influenced by another little-known interagency body, the interagency country risk assessment system, referred to as ICRAS. ICRAS influences lending decisions by determining the budgetary costs to an agency for each loan or loan guarantee the agency issues.

ICRAS is an outgrowth of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, which mandated changes in the budgetary of Federal credit. Loans and guarantees issued by the Government are now assigned a subsidy cost. Subsidy costs depend on the risk level associated with the transaction. For example, a loan judged to have a high risk of nonrepayment will incur a high subsidy cost to the agency issuing the loan.

ICRAS was established to make the risk assessment process consistent across the Government. This group is chaired by the Office of Management and Budget and includes representatives from the Treasury Department, State Department, Department of Agriculture, Defense Security Assistance Agency, Export-Import Bank, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Agency for International Development, and the Federal Reserve. ICRAS evaluates a nation's creditworthiness and assigns the nation to 1 of 11 risk categories.

When making lending decisions, agencies must remain within the constraints of the subsidy budget appropriated for each program. It is through this budget process that ICRAS wields its power. If ICRAS assigns a high-risk rating to a country, it becomes more difficult for each agency to provide that country with assistance and still remain within the subsidy budget. A high-risk assessment effects a nation's likelihood of receiving credit assistance in another way also. Some agencies are prohibited from issuing particular types of loans to nations that are above a certain risk level. In those cases, the subsidy cost does not matter. A high-risk rating can thus entirely eliminate a nation from consideration.

Although ICRAS was created to perform objective analysis, the committee has learned that in several important cases, the group has slanted the risk analyses for political reasons. On a



number of occasions, the State Department delayed ICRAS meetings because it disagreed with the technical staff's assessment of Russia's creditworthiness. Obviously, the State Department believed that the assigned risk level was too high. As I explained, a risk level that is too high would eliminate Russia from participation in some programs. The rating might have forced the administration to admit the potential cost to the taxpayer of these proposals. The State Department's tactic was, as usual, to raise the discussion to the political level. There has even been an ICRAS meeting on Russia at the Assistant Secretary level. Does anyone think that it is an Assistant Secretary's job to objectively decide whether Russia is an acceptable or an unacceptable risk? Clearly, when the process reaches that level, the system has become infused with the political considerations it was intended to screen out to begin with. Economists at several Government agencies have informed the committee that the State Department succeeded at this game during while the Bush administration held power. Russia has consistently received credit ratings that it does not deserve.

Politicizing ICRAS made it easier for the Bush administration to assign a risk rating that would suit its purposes. A lower risk rating makes it easier for the agencies to issue Russia loans, but it brings great risk to the taxpayer.

I am mildly surprised that ICRAS members were even offered the opportunity to debate Russia's creditworthiness, given the way the White House abused the NAC process. The White House could have worked over ICRAS in a similar fashion by simply telling ICRAS what risk level the group must determine.

We can no longer operate assistance programs by distorting credit ratings for Russia or any other country, or issuing guarantees for loans that clearly will not be repaid. We can no longer make important decisions without deliberation. Backdoor aid does little good for Russia and no good for us. We must soberly examine what types of assistance Russia needs and what types of assistance we are able to provide.

I urge the current administration to reconsider the Bush administration's confused policies toward the former Soviet Union. Foreign aid should never be delivered through the backdoor. We should openly debate our options and be honest about the assistance and that cost to the taxpayer. Russia does need our help, and so do others, but we must provide the assistance openly, and we must understand the costs. There is no free lunch, it has often been said, as the GSM's mounting disaster so clearly shows. The only way to get a program that is effective and makes sense is to do it in the old-fashioned way. As

President Truman said: "Tell us what needs to be done, and go about it." The Marshall plan was expensive, it was highly controversial—but it worked. The needs of Russia and other former Soviet States are great. But our response has to make sense, and should never again take the backdoor approach followed by the former administration, and which I hope this administration has resolved to avoid.

#### VOLUNTARY RESTRAINT AGREEMENTS: FOREIGN STEEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, this week the congressional steel caucus held its first hearing of the 103d Congress. Testimony was heard from the head of the Steel Workers Union and representatives of the American Iron and Steel Institute, the Specialty Steel Industry, the Steel Service Center Institute, the Steel Manufacturers Association, and the Committee on Pipe and Tube Imports.

The good news is that during the period of the voluntary restraint agreements [VRA's], the U.S. steel industry invested more than \$35 billion in modernizing their plants and becoming the most productive steel producers in the world.

The bad news is that the dumping of foreign steel into this country in the late 1970's and early 1980's—before the VRA's were put on—so devastated the industry—that over the last decade—employment in steel production dropped from 500,000 to 180,000.

The notion that the steel industry needed protection from the dumping of subsidized foreign steel by the use of VRA's bitterly was fought by the proponents of free trade—the followers of Adam Smith. But, the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the month that the VRA's ran out, rampant dumping of foreign subsidized steel began again.

The preliminary determinations by the Department of Commerce—last month—that 21 foreign nations have systematically dumped steel into our markets should give all of us hope that the next step, before the International Trade Commission [ITC] to assess the amount of damage to our companies, will be equally positive and supportive of the industry.

It is about time that the law of the Congress, the intent of the most representative branch of Government, is recognized by the executive branch and, we hope, will be respected by the judicial branch when damages are assessed by the ITC.

As you are all aware, in the past, trade laws have not been allowed to proceed to conclusion for the steel industry. Settlements have been nego-

tiated with foreign governments in actions which have been invariably detrimental to the domestic industry.

Already, the European Community once again seems to be moving in that direction with the announcement that the multilateral steel agreement meetings reconvened in Geneva, February 24-26. These are the negotiations on which the Europeans walked out, refusing to give up subsidies to their companies.

Now, they respond to the Commerce decision as though it was done purely to get them back to negotiating. Wrong. I am led to believe by all of my sources, that this time, the American steel industry will hold the course—win, lose, or draw on the ITC decision.

I applaud their position. It is a good sign, a heartening sign. I am impressed that the new Trade Representative, Mr. Kantor, has announced that the United States will retaliate against government procurement rules adopted by the EC that favor EC telecommunications and electrical equipment manufacturers.

The Washington Post reported February 2:

The first of the sanctions which would take effect March 22 if the dispute is not resolved, would forbid a number of federal agencies from purchasing a limited range of European products.

It is past time that the United States break the old Marshall plan mindset that Europe and Japan, damaged by World War II, needed, and in some way, deserved special treatment by the rich, victorious United States. We not only encouraged this dependence, to keep them from slipping into the hands of the Communist, but, over the last 40 years, as those countries—Socialist all—accepted this privileged position, they began to reach for more. To the point, that now, any resistance on our part brings charges that we are starting trade wars.

While the Marshall plan proved to be a brilliant political tool against the spread of communism and was, certainly, an incredibly humane concept on the part of a victorious nation over the vanquished—the need for such treatment is long past.

To the contrary, among the industrial nations that we helped rebuild, we are the only ones suffering a trade deficit of monumental proportions, the only net debtor nation of the lot, and we have the largest domestic debt.

This burden has been borne disproportionately by the manufacturing base of this country. Over the years that steel has invested tens of billions of dollars in modernization, the greatest competitor for borrowing money has been the Treasury of the United States ever pushing up the interest rates.

And when those rates broke, on the back of a recession in a national election year, the steel industry and its

customers had credit lines closed, sources of borrowing dried up in the face of the banks moving in to buy Treasury notes rather than lending money on the streets. So, the business expansion needed was nipped in the bud by the banks focusing on a guaranteed 3 to 4 percent spread between return on their T bill investments and an almost record low return on savings invested with them.

Under such financial restrictions, we can hope that—at least—our domestic steel producers will not have to continue to compete unfairly with nations which underwrite their industries' losses, their industries' compliance with environmental laws.

Steel has a good story to tell.

In the past few years the steel industry has accomplished miracles:

Since 1981, despite scarce, high capital in the country, the industry has raised and increased investment in steel by billions of dollars.

Production in raw steel, continuously cast, has gone from 21.6 million in 1981 to 66.6 million in 1990 with a smaller work force. I am proud that in manhours per ton of steel we are lower than Japan, Germany, the United Kingdom, and France.

Employment costs which includes percentage of operating cost, and hourly compensation are lower than the United Kingdom, Canada, Korea, Mexico, Brazil, and Taiwan according to World Steel Intelligence.

From 1979 to 1985, hourly output in factories increased 2.8 percent annually.

From 1985 to 1990 output in factories rose 3.5 percent.

Compensation for Americans as a whole, changed radically in 5 years. In 1985 it averaged \$13.01 for production workers, but by 1990, France, Canada, Norway, and Germany were surpassing American pay levels.

Obviously what we have been talking about in modernization equates to fewer jobs. So, what we need is greater sales to translate these investments into profits and more jobs. For that reason, I believe it is important to watch the procurement actions of government. I know that under GATT pressure the U.S. Governors have decided to abolish buy America, but the recent actions by the EC to protect their own telecommunications industry may make the States rethink this position.

In 1990 there were 12,169 procurement actions which resulted in an award of \$5.1 billion to foreign firms. Without reviewing each job it is difficult to tell about the price, but I can tell you one thing, most of the foreign firms probably were subsidized and, of equal importance, supported by their government in the bidding procedure. Something that does not happen with American business.

With the numbers of new unemployed—50,000 at Sears, 20,000 at Boe-

ing, 2,000 at Kodak, 6,000 at United Technologies, plus the earlier layoffs at GM and IBM—the trade agreements now being negotiated—NAFTA and GATT—must be crafted very carefully to make sure that there is a reciprocity built in—for our industries—to balance the positive effect of the value added tax [VAT] on both European exports and imports. The VAT added to every import serves as an average 19 percent tariff—the VAT rebated to the manufacturer-exporter serves as an average 19 percent export bonus.

In mentioning the accomplishments of the steel industry, I want to point out that American manufacturers in general are doing a much more competent job than the media credits, as these figures testify. For whatever reasons, over this last decade, the popular image of U.S. industry presented on TV and in the movies has been of polluters, malevolent employers who deliberately expose employees to toxic substances—heartless big business—images reinforced by the explosion of investigative TV news shows that make their ratings exposing the rogue, the scoundrel.

Long gone is the image of the employer-benefactor, made popular by the celluloid Jimmy Stewarts, the Spencer Traceys, the Robert Youngs—front page reports on the real characters of the 1980's the Milkins, the Keatings, the Altmans of BCCI fame—employers who seemingly chose to benefit themselves rather than benefit their shareholders, their workers have changed the perception of the average American about American business.

We know—certainly I do—dealing with the Greater Baltimore business community that Milkin and Keating are stereotypical bad guys and Jimmy Stewart, stereotypical of the all-time favorite good guy, and in my long experience in my business community, I've never really dealt with either one of those extreme types.

However, if the movies are going to give us films such as Wall Street with its Milkin-type hero saying, "Greed is good," then, it is only fair that they season the public perception with a major movie on the struggle of a small company—the only industry left in a small town—to overcome the increased costs—estimated since 1989 to have grown by a whopping 34 percent—to implement the growing numbers of Government laws and regulations laid on American businesses.

I would hope they would put a human face on the countless numbers of men and women who have invested the work and savings of a lifetime in creating a business and jobs—some of them discovering 10 to 15 years into the effort—that their industry has slipped into the never-never land of the Superfund and that suddenly, a plant which was valued at \$4 or \$5 million is no longer an asset, but a liability.

That the formerly friendly bank now wants their homes as equity, that the

business which they once thought to leave their children has now become a twilight industry, a veritable albatross.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of heroism left in this country, a lot of fortitude and just plain old American stick-to-it-ism out in the business community or we would have much greater unemployment than we have now.

And, we need to get that story out. We need to have the great numbers of Americans seeking jobs, or hoping for better jobs, young people counting on building careers in good, stable companies, unemployed defense workers and the increasing numbers being let out of the services, all of these people need to know the problems of American industry.

Steel has a good story to tell. I have spent my career in the Congress fighting for machine tools and fasteners, fighting for steel and foundries, fighting for buy America. I have pushed for a Marshall plan for America. Back in 1987 I introduced a resolution calling for a Government commission to study a Marshall plan for our own country.

No takers, then. But, I find it interesting that the Democrat leaders in announcing their budget plans for 1992, called for a Marshall plan for America. I understand that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

As the Congress moves more and more in its demand that companies stand in loco parentis to employees, overlaying all of the requirements of Socialist nations upon a capitalist system, without picking up the tab, as the real Socialists do, it is incumbent upon those of us who know the burdens and real costs of creating jobs to tell the people what the Government regulations are doing to their hopes of finding jobs.

In like manner, the new tax proposals should be studied for the impact on jobs creation over the next 4 years. In proposing an energy tax, heavy manufacturing will be hit the hardest—service sector jobs impacted the least. Steel, auto manufacturing, glass, foundries—every one struggling right now, just to stay afloat will be hit with higher costs some of which must be passed on in product cost—making them less competitive with foreign products—pushing inflation.

If the tax package is being sold to the country as favoring taking money away from the rich and redistributing it to the poor, in the proposed business taxes, it is just the opposite. Proposed tax credits for investment will pay off only to the companies who are making a profit. Wealthy corporations will pay more taxes, but they also are able to take advantage of the tax credit provisions.

But to a whole host of companies—the airlines, basic industries, construction—added energy taxes could push them over the edge and there are



darned few profits for them to either reinvest or take a tax credit against.

For whatever reason, the proposals in this new tax package pits the interest of the have corporations against the have nots—and Goliath wins this one—successful small businesses pitted against the struggling startups—another strong win for Goliath—and agriculture is pitted against everyone else—not only because of program cuts, but because energy costs impact so much on the cost of not only what they do, but what they purchase.

If dividing and conquering works, this tax program should go through. But, it is so devisive of industry—so weighted against the most fragile of our industries and small businesses, including our farmers—that every day which passes with one more revelation of the true cost to the economy of one more of these taxes—makes the chance of its passage lessen.

Government does not create wealth. Government has never created a value-added job. Effective government can only support an atmosphere which allows value-added jobs and wealth to be created. Dividing and conquering may be good politics, but I question that it is good governance.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TUCKER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BONIOR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. GREENWOOD (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PAXON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of death in family.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. GEREN of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of family business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SABO, for 5 minutes, today.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON, in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. DICKEY.

Mr. GILMAN, in two instances.

Mr. THOMAS of California.

Mr. WELDON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. MANN.

Mr. NADLER.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. GLICKMAN.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. WAXMAN.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 920. An act to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 8, 1993, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

840. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting revised supplemental appropriations language for the Social Security Administration's limitation on administrative expenses, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-54); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

841. A letter from the National Council on Disability, transmitting the Council's special report entitled, "Study on the Financing of Assistive Technology Devices and Services for Individuals With Disabilities," pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 781(a)(8); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

842. A letter from the National Council on Disability, transmitting the Council's special report entitled, "Sharing the Risk and

Ensuring Independence: A Disability Perspective on Access to Health Insurance and Health-Related Services," pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 781(a)(8); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

843. A letter from the National Council on Disability, transmitting the Council's special report entitled, "Serving the Nation's Students With Disabilities: Progress and Prospects," pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 781(a)(8); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

844. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Assistance Related to International Terrorism Provided by the U.S. Government to Foreign Countries," pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-7; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

845. A letter from the Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

846. A letter from the Director, Regional Office, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Regional Office activities covering the period October 1, 1992 through December 31, 1993; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 115. A resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 920) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-26); Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MFUME, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 1214. A bill to provide for the regulation of banks and savings associations by a single Federal independent regulatory commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:

H.R. 1215. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to require a reasonable attorney's fee to be awarded to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as a prevailing party; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1216. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 to provide tax incentives for investments in enterprise zone businesses and domestic businesses; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide estate tax relief

for victims of the terrorist-caused airplane crash near Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1218. A bill to provide for economic growth by reducing income taxes for most Americans, by encouraging the purchase of American-made products, and by accelerating transportation-related spending, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Public Works and Transportation, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, and Appropriations.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 1219. A bill to amend the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 to exempt noise and access restrictions on aircraft operations to and from metropolitan airports from Federal review and approval requirements under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 1220. A bill to provide the penalty of death for certain Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 1221. A bill to provide for the reduction of agricultural program debt and for donations of grain to the countries of the former Soviet Union in exchange for certain actions on their part; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. INHOFE):

H.R. 1222. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to impose stiffer penalties on persons convicted of lesser drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.R. 1223. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to establish the National Resource Center for Grandparents; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. HUGHES):

H.R. 1224. A bill to amend section 207 of title 18, United States Code, to further restrict Federal officers and employees from representing or advising foreign entities after leaving Government service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1225. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit contributions and expenditures by multicandidate political committees controlled by foreign-owned corporation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and the Judiciary.

H.R. 1226. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Professional Trade Service Corps, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Post Office and Civil Service, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 1227. A bill to establish the Federal Bank Agency, to abolish the positions of the Comptroller of the Currency and Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, to consolidate and reform the regulation of insured depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 1228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of effectively connected investment income of insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Florida (for himself, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. GRAMS):

H.R. 1229. A bill to provide for the establishment of a joint aviation research and development program between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Armed Services.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow deductions for expenses for advertising tobacco products or alcoholic beverages on television or radio, in newspapers or magazines, or on billboards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. FORD of Michigan):

H.R. 1231. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1931 (known as the Davis-Bacon Act), to revise the standard for coverage under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 1232. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive the application to the District of Columbia Chartered Health Plan, Inc., of the requirement under title XIX of the Social Security Act that limits the maximum number of individuals enrolled with a health maintenance organization who may be beneficiaries under the Medicare or Medicaid Programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROSE, Ms. LONG, Mr. MINGE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. CONNIT, and Mr. SARPALUS):

H.R. 1233. A bill to improve monitoring of the domestic uses made of certain foreign commodities after importation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 1234. A bill to provide that positions held by civilian technicians of the National Guard be made part of the competitive service; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 1235. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for voluntary expenditure limitations, to restrict the practice of "bundling" of contributions, to provide for tax credit and deduction for contributions to candidates for Congress, to require full disclosure of independent expenditures, to eliminate PAC contributions to individual candidates, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REGULA (for himself, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 1236. A bill to correct the tariff rate inversion on certain iron and steel pipe and tube products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

H.R. 1237. A bill to establish procedures for national criminal background checks for child care providers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. GEKAS):

H.R. 1238. A bill to establish constitutional procedures for the imposition of the death penalty for terrorist murders and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 1239. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a 6-month amnesty to encourage payment of back domestic service employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 1240. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase from \$50 per quarter to \$2,000 per year the threshold level at which cash remuneration payable to a domestic employee in any year becomes subject to Social Security employment taxes, to provide for annual adjustments in such threshold amount, and to annualize the payment of domestic service employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 1241. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for increased reward amounts in domestic terrorist cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of California (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SUNDKIST, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. COX, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. HANCOCK):

H.R. 1242. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for fair treatment of small property and casualty insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MURPHY):

H.R. 1243. A bill to prohibit any foreign person from acquiring, directly or indirectly, Allison Transmission, a division of General Motors Corp.; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 1244. A bill to establish a deficit reduction account and a Build America Account in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 1245. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to assist members of the Armed Forces who are discharged or released from active duty to obtain employment with law enforcement agencies and health care providers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SWETT:

H.J. Res. 132. Joint resolution recognizing the Desert Shield/Desert Storm Memorial Light at the Shrine of Our Lady of Grace in Columbia, NH, as a memorial of national significance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEMENT:

H.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the President recognize the role rural communities play in the economy of the United States and express this recognition through appropriate emphasis on rural economic development when preparing the administration's economic proposals; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.J. Res. 134. Joint resolution designating April 25 through May 1, 1993, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.



By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WISE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SWETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. EWING, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KIM, Mr. BLUTE, and Mr. MCKEON):

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to designate the months of May 1993 and May 1994 as "National Trauma Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Mr. WYNN, Ms. MEEK, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. WATT, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DIXON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. E.B. JOHNSON, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. WASHINGTON):

H.J. Res. 136. Joint Resolution designating the month of April 1993 as "National African-American Health Awareness Month"; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any health care reform program enacted by Congress should not discriminate in the treatment of services relating to mental illness and substance abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H. Res. 115. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 920) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WELDON (for himself, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. SHAYS):

H. Res. 116. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the Committee on Ways and Means to include in committee reports the identity, sponsor, and revenue cost of single-taxpayer relief provisions contained in reported bills; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WISE:

H. Res. 117. Resolution limiting the official mail allowance for Members of the House for the second session of this Congress to 80 percent of that allowance for the first session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 58: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 64: Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 65: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 66: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 67: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 68: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 108: Mr. LEWIS of Florida and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 127: Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. REED, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. STOKES, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 140: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SWETT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 162: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BYRNE, Mr. CLINGER, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 163: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 166: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GRAMS, and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 303: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LEVY, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 325: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. WYNN, Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 326: Mr. NADLER, Ms. MEEK, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 388: Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 417: Mr. PORTER, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 419: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 526: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 549: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. INGLIS, and Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 635: Mr. KING.

H.R. 658: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 659: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 667: Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 672: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 679: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 684: Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 692: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STOKES, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. DIXON, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 749: Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 796: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. YATES, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. MEEK, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 818: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. MEEK, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 830: Mr. WYNN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BONILLA, Ms. DUNN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. KING, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 882: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 894: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 918: Mr. GENE GREEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. STOKES,

Mr. FOGLIETTA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MEEK, and Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana.

H.R. 940: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WATT, Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. MEEK, Ms. E. B. JOHNSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 967: Mr. LAROCO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1025: Mr. LEACH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WATT, Mr. MANN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHENK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. E. B. JOHNSON, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1026: Mr. MINGE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BUYER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1048: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1067: Mr. CANADY, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1090: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 1098: Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 1142: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1152: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MINGE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1153: Mr. GALLEGLEY, Mr. BEILINSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COLEMAN, and Mr. LEVY.

H.R. 1161: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 1164: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.J. Res. 10: Mr. BAKER of California and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CARR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FINGERHUT, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. HUTTO and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 30: Mr. INGLIS, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. KING, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PARKER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEVY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. EWING, Mr. FROST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. WHITTEN.

H.J. Res. 118: Mr. GORDON, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 119: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. QUINN.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. MINGE and Mr. BEILINSON.

H. Con. Res. 44: Mr. MCDADE.

H. Res. 43: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Res. 53: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SWETT, Mr. CONDIT, and Ms. FOWLER.

H. Res. 86: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEILINSON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr.

GALLEGLY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. REED, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

# DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 962: Mr. ROGERS.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

16. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the University of Washington, Seattle, WA, relative to DOD policies regarding discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation; to the Committee on Armed Services.